CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD

WEDNESDAY, May 13, 1998

Antimissile Test Yields 5th Failure In A Row

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

A high-priority weapon under development by the Army to guard troops in the field against missile attack suffered its fifth consecutive miss yesterday in an embarrassing setback for both the costly system and the Pentagon's broader missile defense effort.

The failure of the interceptor missile to hit its test target followed weeks of assurances by top officials at the Defense Department and Lockheed Martin Corp. of Bethesda, the prime contractor, that they had fixed problems bedeviling previous intercept tests of the Theater High-Altitude Area Defense program, known as THAAD.

Senior defense officials were unable to explain just what caused the booster rocket to misfire seconds after launch yesterday, sending the interceptor out of control at a test range in New Mexico. Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the problem appeared different from those behind earlier failures. But that has been the pattern in all the THAAD flight tests -- each time, something different has gone wrong.

The repeated inability to demonstrate that THAAD's interceptors can hit incoming warheads has implications beyond battlefield defense. The same "hit-to-kill" concept is at the core of the even more ambitious national antimissile system being designed to protect the United States against long-range missile attack.

Impatient with the administration's efforts, Senate Republicans have brought to the floor this week a bill intended to shore up the U.S. commitment to deploy a national antimissile system. While the administration has agreed to spend nearly $1 billion a year pursuing a national shield, it has put off a deployment decision until 2000 at the earliest, differing with Republican lawmakers on how long it will take Third World adversaries to acquire long-range missiles.

But there is little disagreement between the administration and Congress over the urgency of the threat posed to U.S. troops by medium-range missiles, particularly those under development by North Korea and Iran. This is the threat that THAAD is intended to answer, at a total estimated cost of $15 billion.

The Army system would provide U.S. forces with much greater defensive capabilities than afforded by Patriot batteries, the antimissile system introduced during the 1991 Persian Gulf War against Iraq. Patriot's interceptors are intended to combat shorter-range missiles such as Iraqi Scuds and, even with planned upgrades, lack the speed and range of THAAD models. Further, Patriot was designed initially as an antiaircraft system, while THAAD is being developed specifically to knock down missiles.

The Navy is working on a ship-based counterpart to THAAD, but the Pentagon has no land-based alternative. So defense officials expressed a determination yesterday to proceed with the program, which has cost $3.2 billion since its inception five years ago.

"We will continue to test the program until we get it right," Bacon told reporters at the Pentagon. "It's a complex program -- everybody realizes this."

Key members of Congress also reaffirmed support for the troubled system.

"It'll give the critics plenty of fodder, but I believe in the program, and I believe we'll work it out," said Sen. Robert C. Smith (R-N.H.), who heads the strategic forces panel of the Armed Services Committee.

Lockheed Martin's future role appeared more in doubt. Defense officials had considered bringing in another major defense contractor after the previous failure in March 1997, but instead settled for assurances that Lockheed Martin was tightening its management controls.

A report in March by a panel of independent experts appointed by the Pentagon to assess the missile defense effort said the THAAD program had suffered from significant shortcomings in management discipline, test planning, ground

Officials Consider Reducing Military Presence In The Gulf

Wall Street Journal...See Pg. 2

Clinton To Impose Sanctions On India In Aftermath Of Nuclear Tests

New York Times...See Pg. 3

U.S. Intelligence Under Fire In Wake Of India's Nuclear Test

New York Times...See Pg. 4

testing and preflight review. It faulted program managers for "underestimating the difficulty of performing hit-to-kill intercepts."

Further, it warned that the program remained under intense time pressure to field a system, even after deadlines shifted from 2002 to 2006. The panel recommended "a more deliberate approach" to development.

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.), a leading missile defense advocate and head of the National Security Committee's military research and development panel, said yesterday that he would look for ways to restructure the arrangement with Lockheed Martin or perhaps turn to another company for help.

Yesterday's test, which was postponed for a day because of high winds on Monday at the sprawling White Sands Missile Range, was conducted at 5:20 a.m. local time (7:20 EDT).

Defense officials said the Hera target missile was launched successfully. But the THAAD interceptor did not climb anywhere near the target, going awry about five seconds into its flight. Safety authorities triggered a self-destruct mechanism in the missile, aborting the test and sending debris falling harmlessly in the desert about two miles north of the launch site, according to military officials.

Bacon made the point that not everything about THAAD has been a disaster. "There are significant parts of the program that seem to be working well," he said, citing an especially powerful radar for tracking targets and a computerized battle management system. "The problem has been with various elements of the missile so far."

Different culprits have been cited as the sources of the four previous intercept test failures: a booster malfunction, a miscue between a range radar system and the interceptor, an error in the system responsible for changing the interceptor's angle, and contamination of the interceptor's sensor.

Wall Street Journal May 13, 1998 Pg. 24

Officials Consider Reducing Military Presence In The Gulf

By Robert S. Greenberger and Thomas E. Ricks, Staff Reporters of the Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- Just a few months after going to the brink of war with Saddam Hussein, the Clinton administration is quietly moving toward overhauling its Iraq policy and taking a less confrontational posture.

Top officials still are debating how and when to best execute such a policy. The Pentagon, weary of maintaining 36,000 military personnel and an armada in the Persian Gulf region, is urging a radically reduced presence there -- and in fact is planning on it. Indeed, the U.S. soon will cut back to one aircraft carrier from two in the Gulf. But Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and United Nations Ambassador Bill Richardson are resisting the timing of those moves, arguing they could be mistaken for retreat.

No one in the administration wants to talk on the record about the changes or about the differences over how to make them. But State Department insiders say Ms. Albright believes now isn't the right time for a U.S. military pullback from the region. After a relatively quiescent period, Saddam Hussein recently ramped up the rhetoric. When the U.N. completed a periodic review of sanctions, voting to maintain them, Iraq warned of "grave consequences."

Despite the squabbling about when to make the changes, what is emerging is a sense among top officials that it is time to look differently at Iraq. Top officials know they need to keep close watch over Saddam Hussein, but they would like to stop obsessing over him by responding to his every move with a surge of U.S. troops, jets and ships. That reaction has been expensive, not only in human and financial terms for the Pentagon, but also in straining diplomatic relations with allies in the region, who didn't buy into U.S. saber-rattling earlier this year.

So, instead of keeping a large military force on Saddam Hussein's doorstep, Pentagon thinkers say, the U.S. should warn him that if he moves against his neighbors, or threatens in any way to use chemical or biological weapons, he will be hit and hit hard -- first by U.S. forces in the region, then by forces that would arrive there within a few days.

"This is a reaction to the last crisis, when we were perceived by some Arab states and Europeans as overreacting to provocation by Iraq that wasn't life-threatening, by any means," says Kenneth Katzman, a Mideast analyst at the Congressional Research Service.

U.S. officials have been rethinking their Iraq strategy since the last crisis ended, and trying to anticipate the next one. In February, the U.S. was poised to go to war to ensure access for U.N. weapons inspectors to suspected weapons sites. But focusing mainly on access played into Saddam Hussein's hands. The Iraqi leader yielded on access and is using that concession to argue that U.N. sanctions on him should be lifted. So the U.S. now will emphasize Iraq's broader obligation to fully disclose information about weapons programs.

Similarly, to justify the use of force, the U.S. escalated the rhetoric about the Iraq threat. But the administration never effectively made the case at home to go to war. At the same time, those most vulnerable, Iraq's neighbors, didn't take the threat that seriously.

Many military experts also had grave doubts about the U.S. approach to Iraq. On a Friday afternoon in March, 17 defense experts, including six from the Defense Department, gathered in an office building about a mile from the Pentagon to try to come up with more imaginative approaches to confronting Iraq than the burst of heavy air strikes that the U.S. nearly executed in February. Among other things, they looked at whether smaller-scale Special Forces operations could have an effect. Nonetheless, after examining a variety of scenarios during the five-hour session, only one person in the room endorsed military action as the best way to deal with Iraq.

As a result, there are calls for a lower-key policy. "We don't need to pose a Desert Storm-like threat -- what we need is just a credible threat," says Stephen Cimbala, a Pennsylvania State University political scientist who has been looking at military options in the region. Top military planners, including Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni, the U.S. commander for Mideast operations, believe the new way of viewing the Iraqi threat may face its first big test in October, when the U.N. again reviews whether to lift economic sanctions.

Some military observers argue that the new look at Iraq

isn't so much a big change in policy as a return to normalcy in the Persian Gulf. In the past few years and until the latest crisis, the U.S. military pursued a policy of "near-continuous presence" in the Gulf. When there wasn't an Army battalion on exercise in Kuwait, for example, the Pentagon would ensure that a Marine task force was nearby, to provide ground troops if needed. Similarly, if there were no aircraft carriers in the Gulf, the Air Force would beef up its presence in the region. But the current shift comes after the U.S. has maintained a huge presence in the Gulf for months.

The continuing military presence also has strained relations with Saudi Arabia and some Gulf states. Indeed, while those nations are always nervous about U.S. military reductions, there are indications they would welcome a reduced U.S. presence. According to Pentagon officials, Bahrain wants the U.S. Air Force out. Sen. Conrad Burns, a Montana Republican who recently visited Saudi Arabia and Kuwait with other senators, says the group was "surprised to find that in both countries, there was ... a willingness to contemplate force reductions back to the level that existed prior to the recent increase in deployment."

Under the Pentagon's proposed plans, the number of military personnel in the region would be reduced to 20,000 from 36,000. The U.S. also would take out of the region most of the ships and aircraft it has there. Indeed, some in the Pentagon predict that by the end of 1998, there will be periods when the U.S. has no carriers in the Gulf. The Pentagon plans include keeping a brigade of tanks, along with a handful of Apache tank-killing helicopters operated by rotating military reservists, in Kuwait. The plan to defend that oil-rich state with reservists is a new one.

As part of the new military stance, some Army troops and Air Force attack aircraft based in the U.S. will be kept on a far tighter deployment status than in the past. Just as the 82nd Airborne Division has a battalion on alert at all times, so too will a heavy Army unit be on notice that it must be ready to get to the Gulf within a day or two. Once it arrives there it will operate tanks and trucks that have been prepositioned. Also, whenever there isn't a carrier in the Gulf, one will be kept in the eastern Mediterranean, from which it can reach the Gulf within a few days. Moreover, the carrier's aircraft, by using aerial refuelers, actually can strike Iraq from the eastern Mediterranean.

Congress probably won't object to reducing the U.S. presence in the Gulf, says Rep. Ike Skelton, the ranking Democrat on the House National Security Committee. "Right now, Iraq is off everybody's screen," the Missourian says. "So, I don't think cutting back is going to make that much difference." If the new policy doesn't work, he adds, "we know we can build up again."

New York Times May 13, 1998 Pg. 1

Clinton To Impose Sanctions On India In Aftermath Of Nuclear Tests

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton decided on Tuesday night to impose a raft of economic sanctions on India's government on Wednesday for detonating three underground nuclear explosions, senior administration officials said on Tuesday night.

The president's decision -- made aboard Air Force One as Clinton traveled to Germany -- came after a hectic day in which the administration had offered India a way to avoid the sanctions if it would disavow any future testing or deployment of nuclear weapons, other administration officials said.

But even as nations around the world condemned the tests conducted on Monday, India's government signaled no willingness to consider any of the administration's demands, the officials said. By day's end, India's intransigence cleared the way for the harsh punishments called for in the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, which Congress passed and Clinton signed in 1994, the officials said, speaking on condition of anonymity.

The nuclear sanctions law, never before used, will cut off virtually all U.S. aid to India, bar American banks for making loans to its government and restrict exports of computers and other equipment that might have military uses. It will also require the United States to oppose loans to India by the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund.

"There are no indications from the Indians that they are prepared to take any significant steps," a senior administration official said on Tuesday night. Another official said India responded on Tuesday evening by merely pleading for more time, without directly addressing the administration's concerns.

The president's decision to impose sanctions almost immediately came as other American government officials said there were already indications that Pakistan, India's fierce rival, appeared to be preparing to respond with a nuclear test of its own.

Appearing at the White House on Tuesday afternoon before he left the country, for a meeting with other world leaders, Clinton said he was "deeply disturbed" by India's tests, although he stopped short of announcing the sanctions. Instead he called on India to conduct no further tests and to sign "now and without conditions" the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which prohibits all experiments with nuclear explosions.

The president's remarks largely echoed what administration officials said was conveyed to the Indians in private in a late appeal to convince them to step back from their widely renounced decision to conduct India's first nuclear tests since 1974.

In a letter to Clinton that was dated Monday but disclosed on Tuesday, India's new prime minister, Atal BihariVajpayee, did not address the proposals but simply offered an unrenpentant justification for India's tests. Although Pakistan has long been India's chief rival, Vajpayee cited its fears of China, stemming from their disputed border, as well as China's military and political support to Pakistan.

"Although our relations with that country have improved in the last decade or so, an atmosphere of distrust persists mainly due to the unresolved border problem," he wrote, referring to China. "To add to that distrust, that country has materially helped another neighbor of ours to become a covert nuclear weapons state."

The administration's warnings were delivered to Vajpayee's government on Tuesday afternoon by Thomas Pickering, the under secretary of state for political affairs. Senior State Department officials said Pickering did not explicitly offer the Indians anything, but simply outlined the sanctions India faced and sought to clarify India's statement on Monday signaling a willingness to adhere to some terms of a ban on nuclear testing.

The other officials, however, said the National Security Council had resisted the State Department's recommendation to impose sanctions immediately on Tuesday to allow the Indians time to respond to the appeals. The administration's efforts underscored the scramble to find an effective way to respond to the tests, which not only reignited fears of an arms race in South Asia.

Sen. John Glenn, D-Ohio, who sponsored the law, said today that it was meant to impose punishment, swiftly and harshly. He said India's tests, in defiance of the international ban on testing, was an enormous setback to efforts to reduce nuclear weapons after the tense standoff of the cold war.

"I hope our resolve is very solid in this regard so that we don't look for loopholes for India," Glenn said. "And I consider myself a friend of India, but this is just such a blatant slap in the face to the way the rest of the world is going."

American aid and trade with

India is relatively small, with about $7.7 billion in American exports and $7.3 billion in Indian imports. And compared to to more freewheeling neighbors like Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand and South Korea, India has relied less on borrowing from private international banks.

Still, the sanctions could have enormous political significance that could ripple through India's economy.

"I don't see a huge direct impact on American companies," said Marshall Bouton, executive vice-president of the Asia Society, a non-profit public education organization in New York City. "But it's obviously deeply unsettling to U.S.-Indo relations, and there would be a chilling effect on trade in the short and mid-terms."

The United States gave $143 million in direct aid in the last fiscal year, including developmental and food assistance, and such aid would end in the future. The Pentagon also announced on Tuesday that sanctions would halt the modest military sales and training programs the United States has begun with India.

More significantly, India is the largest borrower from the World Bank, having borrowed $44 billion to date, including $1.5 billion this year. While the United States cannot unilaterally dictate how the World Bank loans money, it wields enormous influence that can be used to block consideration of India's programs.

At the White House on Tuesday, Clinton said India's test "not only threatens the stability of the region, it directly challenges the firm international consensus to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction."

He called on "India's neighbors" -- without naming Pakistan and China -- "not to follow down the path of a dangerous arms race." He then issued a blanket warning that he would impose the sanctions called for by the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act.

"As most of you know, our laws have very stringent provisions, signed into law by me in 1994, and I intend to implement them fully," he said.

The United States joined several other countries in recalling its ambassador to India, Richard Celeste. The White House spokesman, Mike McCurry, also suggested that India's tests might force Clinton to cancel his plans to visit India later this year, a trip intended to culminate a year-long effort to improve American relations in South Asia.

The administration's immediate goal was persuading Pakistan not to conduct its own test, which its government has angrily warned it was prepared to do.

John Holum, the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said it was in neither Pakistan's nor India's interests to engage in "a self-defeating cycle of action and reaction" at a time when their countries struggled with poverty and underdevelopment.

"This is not a route to greater security," Holum said. "It is an opportunity to spend a lot of scarce resources on things that won't make them more secure."

New York Times May 13, 1998 Pg. 1

U.S. Intelligence Under Fire In Wake Of India's Nuclear Test

By Tim Weiner

WASHINGTON -- The United States' inability to foresee or forestall India's nuclear tests, despite ample warnings, was a failure of both the CIA and U.S. foreign policy-makers, government officials said Tuesday.

After the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee called it "the intelligence failure of the decade," Central Intelligence Director George Tenet asked retired Adm. David Jeremiah, a former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to lead a 10-day investigation into the intelligence community's failure to detect preparations at the test site in the Indian desert.

The site has been under periodic surveillance by photoreconnaissance and electronic eavesdropping satellites, , which recorded increasing activity. But the images and activities they recorded in recent days were not interpreted clearly or quickly by the CIA, officials said.

That oversight constituted "a colossal failure on the part of our intelligence agencies," Chairman Richard Shelby, R-Ala., said. "Something went wrong. Somebody failed to do their job. To let this slip up on our policy-makers, the president, the secretary of state, without a chance to intervene in some way diplomatically with India was a huge intelligence failure. If we had an inkling that they were going to detonate one or more nuclear weapons, perhaps we could have intervened. We certainly would have tried."

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., former ambassador to India and former vice chairman of the intelligence panel, said the fault was not just with the intelligence gatherers.

"Why didn't the CIA find this out?" he asked. "The question is why don't we learn to read? What's the State Department for? The political leadership in India as much as said they were going to begin testing. There's a tendency at the State Department to say, 'Gee, the CIA never told us.' "

Administration officials defended their lack of knowledge and action by saying the Indian government had fooled them into thinking that it would not conduct nuclear testing.

"They didn't just fool the CIA, they fooled the entire U.S. government, and I'm the first to admit they fooled me, too," a senior administration official said. "We were all just lulled into thinking they wouldn't do anything regarding nuclear weapons. They let us to believe they were not going to do anything precipitous. We made the mistake of assuming they would act rationally."

He added, "We had no clue."

Others said warning signs were everywhere, to be read by diplomats, as well as spies: the announced intentions of the new Hindu nationalist government to make nuclear weapons part of its arsenal; the published pronouncements of India's atomic weapons commissioner, who said two months ago that he was ready to test if political leaders gave the go-ahead, and recent missile tests by Pakistan that all but dared New Dehli to respond.

A result, administration officials said, was the biggest breach in the arms-control net in years. U.S. policy on stopping the spread of nuclear weapons failed to prevent the test, and that could set off a chain reaction.

It is now far more likely that Pakistan, whose weapons programs have immeasurably been aided by China, to the bitter resentment of India, will test a nuclear weapon, officials said. Administration officials said Tuesday night that they were already seeing signs that Pakistan was preparing to conduct such a test.

The Indian test also increases the chances, they said, that Pakistan will retest its new medium-range missile, the Ghauri, named after a Muslim warrior who defeated a 12-century Hindu emperor, Prithvi, which happens to be the name of India's most advanced missile.

George Perkovich, an expert on the Indian nuclear program and director of the Secure World program at the W. Alton Jones Foundation, said: "The Indians have been out there for months at the site. There was activity, but nobody in the United States said, 'Uh-oh, this means something.' "

Diplomatic silence played a role. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright was appalled, her spokesman said Tuesday night, that Indian Foreign Secretary Krishnan Raghunath met May 1 with National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Undersecretary of State Thomas Pickering but gave no hint of the coming tests.

But in hindsight, the evidence was nearly as clear as it was in December 1995. That month U.S. States spy satellites

saw thick electric cables being installed at a deep hole in the Rajasthan desert, evidence that India was preparing for its first nuclear test since 1974. Word went out that Washington was watching, and the Indians backed down. The test never took place.

The test site in Pokaran was buzzing again this month. But the spy satellites missed the clues. They were looking, but not closely enough to see clearly. The Indians disguised the activities. Sandstorms obscured the site, and in any case, neither the machines nor the people who analyze their output are infallible.

It takes decisions by policymakers and millions of dollars a day to adjust the satellites' orbits, so that they can focus intently 24 hours a day on a target. It is unclear whether the United States had round-the-clock coverage of the site. The satellites take pictures with high-resolution cameras and eavesdrop on telecommunications.

The test site in Pokaran was buzzing again this month. But the spy satellites missed the clues. They were looking, but not closely enough to see clearly.

It takes decisions by policymakers and millions of dollars a day to adjust the satellites' orbits, so that they can focus intently 24 hours a day on a single target. The satellites, some of which cost more than $1 billion, take pictures with high-resolution cameras and eavesdrop on telecommunications with electronic ears.

But they do what their human masters tell them, and they failed to focus on what was really occurring in the Indian desert.

The focus was lacking for U.S. policy as well, said Francine Frankel, director of the Center for the Advanced Study of India at the University of Pennsylvania.

"This crisis has been in the works for a long time," Ms. Frankel said. "We assumed that we could separate our common economic interests and our differences on the nuclear issue. That was never realistic. There were many warnings signs that it was impossible to bridge that gap. We are now faced with a question of whether we want to have a hostile relationship with India."

She said, and Moynihan agreed, that India saw itself as destined to be a global power and that U.S. policy-makers had never understood that vision, adding to India's resentment.

Nor did the Clinton administration see that its failure to accomplish major reductions in nuclear arms in recent years gave India little reason to hold off becoming a nuclear power, Clinton and Bush administration officials said.

When Pakistan tested its Ghauri missile last month, the United States completely misread India's fury, Perkovich said, adding: "The U.S. mistook the silence for calm. They took it to believe the Indians were OK. But they were coldly angered at the U.S. for, in their view, not constraining Pakistan."

On Monday, unnoticed by the United States, that anger reached critical mass.

Washington Post May 13, 1998 Pg. 25

Premier of India Sought Tests In '96

Vajpayee's Earlier Government Fell Before Preparations Could Be Completed

By Kenneth J. Cooper
Washington Post
Foreign Service

NEW DELHI, May 12—Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, who announced Monday that India had conducted three underground nuclear tests, wanted to proceed with such testing when he briefly held power in 1996, but his minority coalition government fell before the necessary technical preparations could be made, sources said today.

Two years later, a two-month-old government with Vajpayee again at the helm dared to do what nine previous governments had not done in the 24 years since India first detonated a nuclear device. Asked why this government had tested when previous ones had not, Pramod Mahajan, a Vajpayee aide, replied: "You needed a bold prime minister to take a decision."

Vajpayee's Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) had long vowed to move India closer toward making nuclear weapons.

It was a politically appealing promise, according to national opinion polls, but it also was the kind of campaign rhetoric that many Western diplomats here mistakenly discounted as unlikely to be implemented because nuclear testing could put this impoverished nation of 950 million at risk of international sanctions.

But the BJP meant every word.

The decision to stage a nuclear test, officials and analysts say, was driven by the BJP's long-standing desire to make India a force in international affairs. Though many of the BJP's central tenets -- including its assertion that all Indians share a common Hindu heritage -- were watered down after it emerged from elections this year without a parliamentary majority and had to bargain over specific issues, its nuclear plank survived intact when the new government assumed power in March.

"As far as BJP is concerned, we have stood for it throughout our life," Mahajan told reporters today.

The day after the nuclear tests stunned the world, while the United States and other countries contemplated imposing sanctions, India celebrated.

"This is a time for popular euphoria and celebration" that is "creating a mood of resurgence," the Indian Express newspaper said in a front-page column by editor Shekhar Gupta.

Parties across India's political spectrum, except Communists, praised the testing as an assertion of national strength and security. Former prime minister H. D. Deve Gowda, who succeeded Vajpayee in 1996, called it "an essential step to promote peace in the world."

India's stock markets, however, reacted adversely to the possibility that foreign donors and lenders would cut off funds in response to the tests. The Bombay Stock Exchange, the benchmark Indian stock index, fell by 1.9 percent.

During his two-week tenure as prime minister in 1996, Vajpayee did not have time to accomplish much, but he did explore the possibility of conducting a nuclear test, sources said.

India's nuclear scientists informed Vajpayee it would take a month for them to prepare for such testing, according to Mohan Guruswamy, who drafted the national security section of the BJP's platform for this year's election campaign. The minority coalition did not have that long, though; it collapsed upon losing its first vote of confidence in Parliament.

Dhirendra Sharma, an anti-nuclear activist, provided a similar account. Shortly after leaving office in 1996, Vajpayee said he had ordered nuclear testing but that government scientists did not want to conduct tests unless the government first won a parliamentary vote of confidence, Sharma recalled.

Now at the head of a somewhat more durable coalition government, Vajpayee strolled out of his official residence at dusk Monday, smiled at journalists assembled on the lawn and dryly announced that India had conducted the tests that afternoon. Then he left without answering questions.

The Vajpayee government managed to keep its testing plans secret for a month in a capital rife with news leaks and rumor-mongering. Only a handful of members of the 40-member cabinet had advance knowledge, sources said.

President K. R. Narayanan, whose role as head of state is largely ceremonial but who technically serves as commander in chief, was not informed until Sunday after his return from an official visit to South America, a Western diplomat said.

A desire to maintain secrecy prompted the government to violate a promise Defense Minister George Fernandes

made last March that nuclear tests would not be conducted until after a strategic defense review by a new national security council. The review has not been completed.

"You cannot debate, discuss and then do a nuclear test," Mahajan, the Vajpayee aide, explained when asked about the discrepancy.

A breakdown in secrecy prevented at least one of Vajpayee's predecessors, P. V. Narasimha Rao, from staging a nuclear test. Rao ordered preparation of the Pokaran testing site for an underground blast in late 1995 but dropped the plan after American intelligence agencies detected the activity and U.S. officials protested.

Brajesh Mishra, the prime minister's top aide, said that no foreign government was notified in advance of Monday's test.

When the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, and Karl F. "Rick" Inderfurth, assistant secretary of state for South Asia, visited India a month ago, they were initially concerned that Pakistan's testing of a ballistic missile the week before might provoke India into a strategic escalation.

Richardson and Inderfurth said they urged restraint and were pleased to find that Indian officials did not bring up the subject of Pakistan's missile, except in response to statements by their American visitors.

In retrospect, the required month of preparation means that Vajpayee probably had already decided to conduct the nuclear tests.

USA Today May 13, 1998 Pg. 6

Tests suggest warheads, experts say

By Steven Komarow
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — India conducted its nuclear tests on Monday with a level of sophistication that confirms its ability to put warheads on missiles.

"This was not a crude, above-ground test done willy-nilly," Lawrence Scheinman, former assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said. The Indians "are very competent ... (and) they have learned the kinds of things they had to learn in order to effectively weaponize their nuclear capability."

A basic atomic warhead can be built from blueprints. The design of the U.S. bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, Japan, in 1945 had never been tested.

But because those crude bombs are big and heavy, usually several tons, they are hard to deliver. Monday's explosions probably confirmed advanced and more powerful designs, perhaps little more than a ton, that India has been working on since its first and only previous atomic test 24 years ago. India already has ballistic missiles.

"The point of these tests was to finalize a warhead for delivery on a missile," said Tom Collina of the Union of Concerned Scientists. "It would not take long for them to take these next steps to have a fully deployed, fielded system."

Three devices were detonated several hundred feet below the rocky desert near India's border with Pakistan, probably in separate holes. The test site was built in the early 1980s. There was no immediate evidence of a radiation leak, which suggested that the holes were properly sealed.

India surely had instruments attached to the bombs, wired to send data in the fraction of a second before they were destroyed. But India hasn't released that data and, because the tests came without warning, the United States did not have its detection equipment on alert. The three simultaneous blasts make it harder for scientists to separate data collected by seismographs and other monitors.

One of the bombs was described as "thermonuclear," suggesting a hydrogen bomb. But seismic readings show a combined explosive force of less than 30 kilotons. That's tiny for a hydrogen bomb, which can yield an explosive force equivalent to millions of pounds of high explosives.

It is possible, experts said, that the "thermonuclear" device was something other than a full hydrogen bomb. It might have been only components.

In addition to testing nuclear designs, India probably was testing miniature detonation devices, said Peter Saracino of the Monterey Institute Center for Nonproliferation Studies.

New York Times May 13, 1998

North Korea Suspends '94 Nuclear Freeze Pact

By Elisabeth Rosenthal

BEIJING -- North Korean officials have announced that they are suspending their compliance with the 1994 nuclear freeze agreement that was intended to dismantle that country's nuclear program. U.S. officials have said the program was intended to produce weapons.

Protesting that the United States had failed to honor promises to send money and fuel oil, a high-ranking member of the North Korean government told a visiting academic Saturday that North Korea had recently decided to unseal a nuclear reactor that under the agreement was to have been closed permanently, and had also barred technicians from packing the last of the reactor's spent fuel rods for shipment out of the country. These rods contain plutonium that can be used in nuclear weapons.

Although North Korea's decision to reopen the plant, in Yong Byon, about 90 miles from the capital, Pyongyang, had no immediate effect, some arms experts called it an ominous symbolic action.

"This is like somebody dusting off the old .45 and making sure that it shines, but not loading it," said Gary Milhollin, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control. "They're sending a clever signal in our direction saying, remember, we can stop cooperating." Milhollin also said that the approximately 200 spare rods did not contain enough plutonium to pose a nuclear threat.

Under the 1994 agreement, North Korea pledged to dismantle its nuclear program in exchange for U.S. promises to build two light water reactors to generate electricity, to deliver 500 metric tons of oil annually. North Korea also promised to ease barriers to trade. Although the United States has run into trouble raising the billions of dollars required to pay for these measures, it has repeatedly said it would carry out its side of the agreement.

But last Friday, North Korea's government-run Korean Central News Agency expressed deep displeasure with the pace of U.S. efforts, and hinted that the North Korean government might restart its nuclear program. North Korea "should no longer lend an ear to the empty promises of the United States' side, but open and readjust the frozen nuclear facilities and do everything our own way," a statement from an unidentified Foreign Ministry official said.

And the next day, North Korean Foreign Minister Kim Yong Nam elaborated on the statement in a private two-hour meeting in Pyongyang with an American expert on Korea, Selig Harrison, of the Twentieth Century Fund.

According to Harrison, Kim

said that on April 19, the North Koreans had opened up the previously sealed plant to "conduct maintenance on the reactor," and had also halted the "canning of spent fuel rods" from the reactor. Two hundred of the reactor's 8,000 rods have not yet been prepared, he said.

"We are keeping up our progress in implementing the nuclear freeze agreement, but the U.S. is behind," Kim told Harrison, who spoke with reporters in Beijing en route back to the United States. "So we have now decided to slow down and suspend certain aspects of the agreement." He said that once the United States had a chance to "catch up," North Korea would resume cooperation.

The North Koreans contend that the United States is behind schedule in heavy fuel shipments and in its preparations to build the new reactors, to be completed by 2003.

Saturday, the State Department said that the United States had lived up to its obligations, noting that even though oil shipments have been somewhat slow for the first part of the year, the stipulated quota would be met by year's end. "Anything that would happen to undermine the integrity of that agreement from the North Korean side or from the outside would be, in our view, extremely lamentable and regrettable," said Undersecretary of State Thomas Pickering.

As to whether the North Korean action of reopening the reactor at Yong Byon threatened the agreement, a State Department official who spoke on condition of anonymity said that he had no information about the unsealing of the plant. He said that whether the act violates the agreement depends on what those "maintenance activities are," whether they are "restarting the reactor or sweeping the floors."

He added that, according to the U.S. government's information, "the canning of the rods is essentially done," although he acknowledged that a small fraction of the rods -- some in fragments -- might remain.

North Korea has generally honored its commitments under the 1994 agreement, experts said, largely dismantling its nuclear program and lifting restrictions on trade with the United States.

But the course of the agreement has been bumpy. The United States has been unhappy with what it sees as North Korea's tepid attempts to improve relations with South Korea. North Korea, in turn, had been angered by what it regarded as the United States' halfhearted efforts to remove trade barriers -- efforts that have so far been mostly limited to allowing phone and fax lines.

Despite the announcement, Harrison said that North Korean leaders had made some conciliatory statements during his talks. He said they signaled that they might be willing to negotiate with both the United States and South Korea to create a new type of peacekeeping force and structure for the tense Korean demilitarized zone. North Korea has previously refused to deal with Seoul as an equal partner on the issue.

Harrison said that Lt. General Ri Chan Bok said: "If there is an official proposal from the U.S. side for such a trilateral structure, we will consider it affirmatively."

New York Times May 13, 1998

Bosnian Grave May Be Further Proof Of '96 Massacre

By Mike O'Connor

KAMENICA, Bosnia-Herzegovina -- Deep in a remote rural stretch of Bosnia, war crimes investigators Tuesday found a tangle of buried bodies that they say are some of the 7,500 Muslim men hidden in an effort to thwart the prosecution of Bosnian Serb leaders for genocide.

Investigators for the war-crimes tribunal contend that thousands of Muslims were originally buried near the execution sites, then dug up by earthmovers and moved to more than 10 places in order to hide the evidence.

Exhumations in 1996 recovered 480 bodies, and 7,500 were still missing from the town of Srebrenica. Finding the others has been the goal of war-crimes investigators for more than two years.

The massacre was the worst war crime in Bosnia, and the worst in Europe in a half century, and raised added alarms because the town was being protected by the United Nations.

The discovery Tuesday -- and the thousands of bodies that investigators expect to find nearby -- will bolster the cases against two Bosnian Serb leaders, Radovan Karadzic and Gen. Ratko Mladic, the investigators say. Both have been indicted for genocide by the tribunal in the Hague.

Investigators for the tribunal spoke Tuesday on condition of anonymity.

Satellites that can locate bodies decomposing underground, according to foreign military officers working with the tribunal, aided the search. Witnesses to the reburial also offered testimony, tribunal officials said.

The first remains were uncovered Tuesday morning at 10:40. Investigators unfurled a thin silvery sheet to protect their find from the sun. Next to it, small orange flags had been stuck in the ground to mark pieces of evidence like bits of clothing or shell casings.

About 6 feet away, on what they considered one edge of the mass grave, forensic anthropologists and forensic archaeologists were digging a trench in order to gauge the length and depth of the grave. By early afternoon, the trench was 30 feet long, 6 feet deep, and growing.

Investigators in blue jumpsuits had lightly scraped off the topsoil with a small backhoe. The earth in the mass grave was dull greenish brown, discolored, said investigators, by the bodies. The smell made some of those digging cover their mouths.

Gently then, with trowels and paint brushes, the scientists began to work their way down through the earth. They revealed dark splotches several feet long, created by the decomposition of nearly whole bodies. Then came partial skeletons, skulls and leg bones.

Separating the excavation site and the grass that runs into wooded thickets nearby was a stream of red and white tape. It was a warning to investigators not to step out of their work area because of land mines.

American soldiers, who patrol this part of Bosnia, are guarding the site. Small groups of them, sweating under their bulletproof vests, occasionally came by and observed the work.

The site is about eight miles down a rocky track from a rural road. Every house visible from the track -- all of them formerly Muslim homes -- is either badly damaged or destroyed by fires or explosive charges set during the war.

Along the track people had stuck kitchen pots on fence posts as a warning that the fields nearby are also mined. The only person evident near the track was an elderly Serb, a woodcutter dressed in rags, carrying an ax and barefoot.

Tuesday evening, according to a tribunal official, a layer of tangled bodies across an area of 200 square feet had been exposed. The bones were so intertwined, the official said, that it was not possible to exhume any of them Tuesday.

"We know who is responsible for the murders at the original places," said a tribunal official. "When we can show that these bodies were first buried there and then reburied here, we can connect the guilty to these victims also."

Proving that the soil around the bodies came from the original mass graves, or that shell casings found here match those found at execution sites will establish the connection they are looking for, investigators said.

"We will have hard and fast evidence that there was a large effort to conceal this horrible crime," said a tribunal official, who then said Tuesday's discovery could produce more indictments. "You can't say all this was done by just a handful of people working on their

own. This was organized and directed."

For their part, many Bosnian Serbs have pointed to the absence of bodies as evidence that the men are still alive and that the cases against Karadzic and Mladic are only intended to malign the Serb people.

When the original sites were first inspected in 1996, investigators suspected that most of the bodies had been moved. Strong doubts were cast on the American military's satellite surveillance, with some investigators charged at the time that slipshod monitoring had allowed Bosnian Serb authorities to move the bodies undetected.

Now, however, tribunal officials say the bodies were moved in October 1995, before the pinpoint satellite surveillance was requested by the tribunal. Once the original sites were discovered to have been tampered with, American satellite photographs of the region were reviewed and were found to show trucks and earth-moving equipment at the original burial sites, according to tribunal officials.

Washington Post May 13, 1998 Pg. 21

Gunmen Kill Former Colombian Defense Chief

BOGOTA, Colombia—Gunmen killed a former Colombian defense minister in a crime authorities said was part of a "destabilization campaign" that highlighted the country's endemic violence prior to elections May 31. Retired Gen. Fernando Landazabal Reyes had just left his home in the north of the capital when two gunmen opened fire on him from near point-blank range, police and witnesses said.

Landazabal, 75, was a member of the main opposition Conservative Party and had been closely involved in the presidential campaign of Harold Bedoya, a hard-line former armed forces chief. There was no immediate claim of responsibility for his killing. But Landazabal was a staunch rightist who opposed government efforts to open peace talks with Colombia's leftist guerrilla groups when he was defense minister.

Los Angeles Times May 13, 1998

Holbrooke Reports No Progress In Kosovo Talks

By Tracy Wilkinson

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia -- In the difficult months that former U.S. diplomat Richard Holbrooke negotiated an end to the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Serbs who received the brunt of his persuasive powers added a new word to their vocabulary: Holbrukciti, or, ``to Holbrooke'' to achieve something by brute political force.

But on Tuesday, the weary American envoy was unable to report progress after four days of intense talks with Serbian authorities and ethnic Albanian leaders aimed at averting all-out war in the Serbian province of Kosovo. ``The distance between the two sides still remains very substantial,'' Holbrooke said.

Holbrooke, now a Wall Street banker, was re-enlisted for an emergency U.S. mission to break the deadlock between Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and Kosovo Albanians who are demanding independence. He shuttled back and forth between the two but appeared to be making little headway.

The discouraging news came as the first victims were claimed in Pristina, Kosovo's capital, lending weight to warnings that violence will escalate if the 11th-hour diplomatic gestures fail. At least one ethnic Albanian man in his 60s was shot to death by Serbian police when they launched a predawn raid on what they identified as a safe house for armed guerrillas. Police said Albanian youths opened fire, but leaders in the ethnic Albanian community said the man was gunned down as he looked on.

Holbrooke and U.S. senior Balkans envoy Robert Gelbard were to continue talks Wednesday. Holbrooke helped broker accords that in December 1995 ended the war in Bosnia, which claimed more than 200,000 lives.

Although many people portray Kosovo as ``the next Bosnia,'' Holbrooke noted key differences, including the true ethnic divide that exists between Albanians and Serbs -- unlike Bosnian Muslims and Serbs, they speak different languages, for example -- and the cultural and religious significance attached to the region.

Also, he noted that there was international support for Bosnia's 1992 succession from the former Yugoslavia; similar support does not exist now for Kosovo. Bosnia was a republic, where Kosovo has the lower legal status of province.

``This is a very different situation from Bosnia,'' Holbrooke said in an interview. ``It begins with the fact that all outside governments accept the fact that Kosovo is part of Yugoslavia, where in Bosnia people agreed on the exact opposite.''

Holbrooke and Gelbard began this new series of talks after the United States and its main Western allies tightened sanctions against Yugoslavia to punish Milosevic for his refusal to accept foreign mediation in the crisis. But Milosevic, after meetings with Holbrooke, repeated his refusal.

Far from a spirit of compromise, official rhetoric seemed to be hardening. Vlajko Stojiljkovic, Serbian minister of interior, which oversees the police forces who make up the bulk of troops deployed in Kosovo, lashed out at the Albanian ``terrorists'' and their Western backers.

``It is impossible to understand that Albanians want an 'ethnically clean,' Nazi, fascist Greater Albania, like Mussolini in the Second World War,'' he said in a speech marking Interior Ministry Day. ``It is even more strange that certain so-called democratic countries in the West are supporting them.''

And a statement, purported to be from the guerrillas, known as the Kosovo Liberation Army, called on Albanians to ``stiffen the resistance'' and admonished that ``fierce fighting to expand liberated territory'' will continue.

The rebels control large chunks of rural territory in desolate Kosovo, including some back roads and numerous villages. But until Tuesday, no fighting had been reported in Pristina.

Baltimore Sun May 13, 1998 Pg. 13

U.N. chief 'satisfied' with Iraqi arms inspections

Annan takes steps to speed lifting of international sanctions

FROM WIRE REPORTS

PARIS — U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan said yesterday that he was "satisfied" Iraq was complying with arms inspections and expressed hope that the new cooperation will speed the task.

Annan met with Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz for a half-hour in Paris to discuss developments since a Feb. 23 accord under which Iraq agreed to open all sites, including President Saddam Hussein's palaces, to weapons inspectors.

"I am satisfied that things have much improved and Iraq has lived up to its obligations under the memorandum," Annan said.

Annan met with French President Jacques Chirac just before his talks with Aziz. France, a past ally of Baghdad, is pressing for lifting the sanctions, which have been

in place since 1990.

Annan said the Iraqis want to cooperate with the United Nations and UNSCOM, the U.N. Special Commission that oversees inspections, to get the inspections behind them as soon as possible.

"The relation is improving between UNSCOM and Iraq," he said, "and we hope this is going to continue into the future and that with this cooperation we can accelerate our work."

Aziz arrived in Paris on Monday night and plans more talks with officials in Brussels and Rome to rally support.

He said he would give Chirac a message from Saddam Hussein tomorrow and request that French officials step up their efforts to get the sanctions lifted. He is also scheduled to meet with Prime Minister Lionel Jospin.

France, Russia and China — all permanent members of the U.N. Security Council — want the United Nations to reduce inspections of Iraqi nuclear facilities and ease sanctions. They have cited a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency, which found no evidence that Iraq is still developing nuclear weapons.

But the United States and Britain, the other two permanent members, say although Iraq has made progress on nuclear arms and cooperation with weapons inspectors, it is nowhere near to eliminating its weapons of mass destruction.

A compromise may be in the offing at the United Nations. The United States and Russia have agreed on procedures to scale back inspections of suspected Iraqi nuclear facilities, which diplomats said would probably take until October.

The new compromise, Clinton administration officials said, involves an interim report from the IAEA at the end of July in regard to remaining queries they had about the nuclear program.

New York Times May 13, 1998

U.S. Reportedly Backed British Mercenary Group In Africa

By Raymond Bonner

LONDON -- A British mercenary force that helped carry out military operations in Sierra Leone this year kept the Clinton administration fully informed of its activities and had its tacit support, the military group and a senior administration official said.

The operation was successful from the perspective of Washington and London, helping restore to power an elected president of Sierra Leone, Ahmed Kabbah, who had been ousted by a brutal group of army officers in a coup a year earlier.

But in accomplishing its mission, the private army, Sandline International, which was paid $10 million on behalf of Kabbah to arm and train a force to return him to power, reportedly brought in planeloads of assault rifles, mortars, and ammunition, more than 100 tons altogether, all in violation of a U.N. arms embargo on Sierra Leone.

In Britain, the disclosures about Sandline, which first came to light in March in Africa Confidential, a newsletter here, have become front-page news, creating a political maelstrom. Foreign Minister Robin Cook, under attack by the press and the political opposition, has said he will resign if the arms embargo was knowingly violated.

On Monday, Prime Minister Tony Blair dismissed the allegations as a lot of "hoo ha," and praised the British ambassador in Sierra Leone, Peter Penfold, who reportedly coordinated the Sandline operation, for helping restore the elected president. On Tuesday, Blair's office released an "unprompted" letter from Kabbah, who said that he neither had sought nor was offered arms, supported by the British government.

Kabbah was restored in March with the help of a Nigerian-led African force that ousted the junta. Sandline said it had been asked by Penfold to assist the effort.

Last month, the British customs authorities opened an investigation into whether Sandline broke the embargo with the approval of Cook's ministry. In Parliament on Tuesday, Cook vehemently denied that his office had ever received notice that the embargo would be broken. "I can flatly and firmly make it clear that no papers suggesting the breach of the arms embargo by Sandline or anybody else ever went to my office in March or anytime before that," he said.

Washington has also sought to play down the affair.

In his briefing on Monday, the State Department spokesman, James Rubin, described Sandline as merely a "private security firm that protected mining and construction interests in Sierra Leone."

A few Sandline "employees" remained in Sierra Leone after the coup last year, and they "periodically contacted State Department officials and commented on the situation in Sierra Leone," Rubin said. "But we are not aware -- at least I am not aware -- of any information provided on possible arms shipments."

But Sandline, and a senior American official, tell a different story.

In a confidential letter sent to Cook on April 24, Sandline's lawyers wrote that Sandline had kept the State Department informed "at the highest level." Among those briefed, the lawyers said, were the American ambassador in Sierra Leone, John Hirsch, and senior State Department officers. The letter also says the operation, which included "both personnel and military equipment," had the support of the Defense Department.

Speaking on the condition of anonymity, the senior administration official generally confirmed this. "We were fully aware of what was going on," he said. He said Washington was pleased that Britain took the lead among Western nations in helping oust the junta, and described American support for Sandline's operation as "passive," rather than active.

After the coup last May, as the generals turned more brutal and the killing mounted, Washington and other governments were despairing of what to do. "The only people willing to do something was Sandline," the official said.

As for the State Department's assertion that it knew nothing about the arms shipments, the official said: "If you believe that, well, I've got some other information to sell you."

In October, when all diplomatic attempts to oust the mutinous generals had failed, the U.N. Security Council imposed an arms embargo on Sierra Leone.

Press accounts said that weapons for the Sandline operation were purchased in Bulgaria and flown in from the airport at Burgas, Bulgaria.

Kabbah agreed to pay Sandline $10 million for weapons and training, Sierra Leone's information minister, Julius Spencer, said in Freetown on Monday.

Sandline was also awarded diamond concessions in the country.

In this regard, Sandline was acting on behalf of a mineral trader, Rakesh Saxena, who underwrote the Sandline operation in Sierra Leone, according to published reports here. The reports include faxes between the head of Sandline, Lt. Col. Tim Spicer, and Saxena.

Saxena is alleged to have embezzled more than $100 million as an adviser to the Bangkok Bank of Commerce. He fled to Canada, where he was arrested and released on $1-million bail. He is now back in jail, but while on bail made the arrangements to hire Spicer, according to press accounts in Canada.

Sandline was founded in 1995 by Spicer, a Briton who fought in the Falklands and was the spokesman for Gen. Michael Rose, the U.N. commander in Bosnia.

This is not the first time that

Sandline has been at the center of a controversy. Last year, the prime minister in Papua New Guinea signed a $36-million contract with Sandline for its services in putting down a rebellion in Bougainville. When news of the hiring of mercenaries became public in Papua New Guinea, rioting broke out, army officers mutinied, and the prime minister was forced to resign.

New York Times
May 13, 1998

Emirates To Buy 80 Lockheed Fighters

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The United Arab Emirates plans to buy dozens of American-made F-16 jet fighters in a deal valued at $6 million to $8 billion, Vice President Al Gore and the nation's Crown Prince, Sheik Khalifa bin Zayed al-Nahayan, said Tuesday.

The emirates, situated on the Persian Gulf, will purchase 80 F-16 Fighting Falcons under the contract.

The deal is considered a triumph for the Lockheed Martin Corporation, which earlier in the competition seemed to be lagging behind a French entry, Dassault Aviation, maker of the Ravale aircraft. The Euro fighter, which is being developed by a European consortium, was also considered despite being a latecomer to the competition.

New F-16 sales may not necessarily create new jobs, although they could help avoid some planned layoffs. Lockheed recently said it intended to cut 2,000 of its 11,000 jobs in Fort Worth.

The emirates deal comes at an important point for F-16 production. Currently, the last delivery for the United States Air Force is scheduled in 2001, meaning that the production line will be sustained only by foreign sales unless Congress decides to purchase new planes.

Sales to the United Arab Emirates would keep the line running through 2005 at least, and possibly a few years beyond that, depending on the size of the orders.

Federal Computer Week May 11, 1998 Pg. 10

Acquisition reform key to defense, Cohen says

BY BOB BREWIN

Top Defense Department officials focused attention last week on acquisition reform, with Defense Secretary William Cohen saying that "accelerating acquisition reform remains one of our most important priorities."

Cohen, in remarks kicking off DOD's third annual Acquisition Reform Week, which was begun to reinforce reforms recommended by the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, said, "Without institutionalizing acquisition reform, we cannot ensure that our warfighters will have the best weapons and equipment to carry out their missions in the future."

Jacques Gansler, undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, said that in the past two years the Pentagon has "undertaken a dramatic transformation in the way we do business...[with] much success in making changes necessary to trim costs, reduce cycle times, adopt new processes and procedures to manage our contracts, trim our work force and eliminate excess infrastructure."

But, Gansler said, the Pentagon has just started the job of transforming DOD business practices and needs to do much more to meet its commitment to deliver new major defense systems in 25 percent less time by 2000.

Speaking at a ceremony in the Pentagon courtyard last week to mark the start of Acquisition Reform Week, Gansler said the "next phase of acquisition reform will expand on current and past efforts to revolutionize the way we do business as we concentrate on further adapting commercial 'best practices' to Defense needs."

This includes, Gansler said, a complete restructuring of support systems, significant infrastructure reduction, greatly reduced cycle times, competitive sourcing of the vast majority of support and infrastructure work and, perhaps most important, civilian/military industrial base integration.

Gansler said that the next phase of acquisition reform must also include a change in government cost accounting and auditing requirements that some "find overly burdensome, and which some of our critics claim are antiquated and highly unreliable."

The DOD must totally re-engineer its logistics and logistics information systems as part of the acquisition reform effort, Gansler said. "We are living today with a 1950s logistics model that is no longer affordable and which fails to provide acceptable performance," he said. "Advanced information systems and rapid transportation are keys to our success in this area."

Bob Dornan, senior vice president of Federal Sources Inc., said, in general, DOD "has gone a lot further and faster [with acquisition reform] than we ever thought [it] would, and for that I give [DOD] a B-plus." But in the logistics area, more than talk is needed, Dornan said, because "they have been talking about reforming logistics for 20 years at least."

Darleen Druyen, the Air Force principal deputy for acquisition and management, said the service has developed new processes that will require a "cultural shift" by both industry and the service. She said that shift includes opening up communications in a way that "provides a clearer, unobstructed two-way path for getting work force and industry process improvement ideas to senior Air Force leaders." The Air Force also needs to integrate its acquisition reform initiatives in a way that will eliminate redundancy and provide greater efficiencies, she said.

Secretary of the Navy John Dalton said in the past five years the Navy has made a commitment "to transform ourselves, [and] we have invested in a lot of areas, [including] efficiencies from business and industry, radical procurement approaches, innovations in leadership and management and a heavy reliance on technology to make our smaller force incredibly potent and agile."

Dalton said this "transformation is far from over. We still have a bureaucracy, and we still have faults.... But I promise...if there is something worth doing, the time is right. Our elected officials are ready to field the truly revolutionary ideas that exist."◀

Defense Daily May 13, 1998 Pg. 11

Cohen Names Advisors To Monitor Calif. Depot Competition

By Greg Caires

Defense Secretary William Cohen yesterday named three "highly respected and knowledgeable" government officials to serve as independent advisors to monitor the ongoing depot maintenance competition involving work now conducted by the Sacramento Air Logistics Center at McClellan AFB, Calif.

The independent advisors will "assist in assuring that the source selection process is conducted in a manner that is consistent with the request for proposals and the evaluation criteria," according to a Pentagon statement. The advisors will have access to all source selection information they consider necessary and will provide independent advice to the Air Force's source selection authority.

The independent advisors are:

- Retired Air Force Gen. Robert T. Marsh. Marsh retired from active duty with the Air Force in 1984. His last assignment was as commander of the Air Force Systems Command. Since his retirement, Marsh has served as an aerospace consultant;
- Air Force Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Eickmann, who retires next month. Eickmann, who served most recently as the commander of the Aeronautical Systems Center at Air Force Material Command, has been appointed by the University of Texas. Previously, he was the director of Logistics at Air Force Material Command and a former commander of the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center at Tinker AFB, Okla.; and,
- Dennis Trosch. Trosch served for many years as the deputy general counsel for acquisition and logistics in the Pentagon's Office of the General Counsel. He retired from federal service in 1996 and has worked as a consultant on acquisition and related matters.

Earlier this month, Cohen directed the appointment of the independent advisors to reinforce the "perception of objectivity" in workload competition, the Pentagon's statement adds.

The workload at Sacramento ALC primarily consists of KC-135 tanker maintenance and industrial commodities repair. Bids for the workload are due to the Air Force by June 19, but so far only a team composed of Boeing [BA] and the Ogden ALC at Hill AFB, Utah, has shown interest in bidding on the Sacramento work.

The Air Force is scheduled to select the winner of the Sacramento ALC competition by the end of FY '98.

Jane's Defence Weekly
May 13, 1998

New Attack Submarine May Be Inadequate

Barbara Starr,
Washington DC

The US Navy's (USN's) planned New Attack Submarine (N-SSN) may be inadequate because some of its system requirements have been reduced at a time when the open-ocean threat has increased, warns the General Accounting Office (GAO) in a new report.

"Without an evaluation that reflects current conditions, DoD [Department of Defense] and navy programme officials appear to have little basis for their confidence in how the submarine, with its design changes, will perform," said the GAO.

Computer simulations are the major tool for assessing the nuclear-powered submarine's capabilities. Since a survivability modelling analysis conducted in June 1995, the navy has reduced performance levels of some subsystems below optimal levels, the GAO said.

A 1997 assessment recommended that the service develop a new modelling baseline to reflect the reduced performance and the increased threat.

The USN will spend $64 billion over the next 18 years to acquire 30 N-SSNs. The requirement is for 10 to 12 N-SSNs to be in the fleet by 2012 with the same quieting levels as the SSN 21 Seawolf class but at a lower cost.

Although the latest threat assessments remain classified, the report repeatedly stated that the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI) revised its estimates and noted "several advances" in the open-ocean anti-submarine warfare threat. The DoD acknowledged the ONI's classified assessment but said that "financial and technical difficulties" could delay those improvements.

It has been noted separately in open sources that advanced Russian submarine designs could pose a challenge to the USA.

Electronic warfare (EW) and acoustic intercept are two key subsystems that have been restructured. In EW, navy FY98 funding cuts resulted in the system being assessed to meet "minimal levels" of capability, the GAO said. Congress did restore some funding for specific emitter identification, full implementation of precision radar band direction-finding and interception of frequency-hopping communications.

The acoustic system was also cut due to internal budget reductions. Navy testers have noted uncertainties about whether the system will now meet requirements. On other potential problems the GAO said:

**The navy still must decide on a propulsor design. Testing on two proposals began in March because an interim design did not meet cavitation design goals for noise reduction;

**External communications systems using a 17in antenna will only be able to process the required data if all of the navy's current satellite resources are allocated to submarine communications;

**The TB-29 towed array for threat detection has been deemed to be too expensive by the navy but there is no approved design for a new system.

In responding to the GAO report, the DoD agreed that additional modelling and analysis should be conducted. It also noted that operational assessments scheduled for FY02 will assess the impact of changes on overall N-SSN performance.

The GAO said the USN should assess the overall survivability of the N-SSN design based on the cumulative impact of the recent changes.

European Stars & Stripes
May 13, 1998 Pg. 3

Panels Divided Over Defense Bill

Lawmakers Differ Over Pay Raises, Troop Strength

By Chuck Vinch
Washington bureau

WASHINGTON – Two powerful congressional committees are divided over such high-profile military issues as pay raises and troop strength in the fiscal 1999 defense authorization bill.

Those differences emerged

as the House National Security Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee wrapped up work on their respective draft versions of the $257.3 billion bill late last week. For example, the Senate committee approved the Pentagon's request for a 3.1 percent military pay raise next year. But the House committee wants to boost that to 3.6 percent to keep the reputed "gap" between military and private-sector pay, now pegged at more than 13 percent, from widening.

Likewise, the Senate committee granted the Pentagon's request to cut military end strength by 23,512 next year, bringing the active-duty force down to fewer than 1.4 million troops.

But lawmakers on the House committee said that is too much of a cut, given persistent reports of manpower shortages in all the services. Their bill would allow an end strength cut of about 12,570. "The committee believes the president's end strength request is inadequate to provide the forces needed to carry out the current national military strategy, support the current operations tempo, and provide a decent quality of life," stated the explanatory report that accompanies the bill. Furthermore, the House committee wants to override the Pentagon and move ahead with the recent recommendations of an independent panel to house male and female recruits separately during basic training.

The Senate committee, on the other hand, wants to wait until a final report is submitted by a congressional commission formed late last year to study the issue. That report is not expected until next March.

The bills will now be sent to the full House and Senate for debate. Once they are approved, negotiators from each chamber will meet to iron out differences in their respective draft versions. The resulting compromise bill then goes back to the full House and Senate for a final vote before President Clinton signs it into law. The authorization bill is one part of the two-part legislative process that forms the Pentagon's budget. Separate appropriations bills provide the money for projects authorized.

Several lawmakers on both panels complained this year about their hands being tied by the balanced budget agreement that bars them from simply adding money to the overall defense spending plan, as they've done in each of the last three years. Even so, lawmakers whittled down a wide range of defense spending accounts to come up with extra funds to deal with what they consider to be the biggest shortfalls in the military budget.

In military construction, the House panel added $450 million and the Senate panel added $500 million to the Pentagon's request of $7.8 billion. More than one-third of the extra money would pay for quality-of-life projects such as housing and child care centers, most of them in the United States.

Both committees also piled on funds for operations and maintenance. The House panel added $735 million and the Senate panel added $476 million for depot maintenance, spare parts, upgrades to training centers and real property maintenance. In procurement, both committees added money to various programs to give the Pentagon more UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, V-22 Osprey aircraft and special purpose C-130 aircraft than the Clinton administration had asked for.

Rep. Floyd Spence, R-S.C., House National Security Committee chairman, has criticized the Clinton administration for consistently underfunding the Pentagon budget and allowing cracks in military readiness and quality-of-life programs to widen.

Overall defense spending has declined for 14 straight years when the total is adjusted for inflation, he said.

"The committee was unable to address as many of the military's growing shortfalls as we have in the past," Spence said. "But we've done the best job possible under the circumstances."

Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said the balanced budget agreement and the high pace of military operations around the world "continue to raise concerns about readiness."

"The administration keeps asking the military to do more with less," said an aide to Thurmond. "Congress has been able to plug the biggest holes over the past few years, but we can't keep pulling rabbits out of the hat."

Defense Daily May 13, 1998 Pg. 4

Cohen To Vest Joint Experiments With Atlantic Command

By Vago Muradian

Defense Secretary William Cohen is expected to vest oversight of joint warfighting experiments with the U.S. Atlantic Command (ACOM), according to a senior Joint Chiefs of Staff officer.

"We are looking at them picking up a lot of the work that is being done by the services on the roadmaps, the master training plans" to realize the Joint Staff's long-range *Joint Vision 2010* strategy, Army Maj. Gen. George Close, the director of operational plans and interoperability on the Joint Staff, told *Defense Daily* last week following an address at the Global Air & Space Conference in Arlington, Va.

"The charter [for the shift] is in final coordination...the chairman wants to make sure we get this coordinated quickly. All the services have already bought into it."

Pending Cohen's approval, effective Oct. 1 ACOM would gain control of a range of so-called joint warfighting experiments--which range from small wargames to large-scale training exercises--geared toward testing and assessing the merits of new organizations, doctrine, tactics and equipment that will allow U.S. military forces to fight in as joint a manner as possible.

ACOM in its new role will develop a program for conducting joint warfighting experiments as well as defining future experiments. Currently, the military services, as well as other defense agencies, conduct such experiments.

Close said that ACOM was the logical choice to take over the functions because it already has an "exhaustive training role" and also has oversight of 11 of the Pentagon's 41 Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration programs that test emerging technologies.

"Initially, it'll just be a couple of experiments a year," Close said. "But as we begin matching up vision with resources, keep in mind vision is not a vision unless you have resources tied to it. So as we begin to get more and more into the [five-year budget] and we figure out where we are going in regard to these road maps, ACOM will get more and more involved in the [experiments]."

Joint Staff Considering Other Changes

The Joint Staff is considering as is seeks to unify the military services into the cohesive force outlined in the *Joint Vision 2010* document. Crafted largely by now-retired Army Gen. John Shalikashvili, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the

document is a blueprint to prepare the U.S. military for a range of future threats.

"One of the things we're talking about is potential unified command plan changes, but that is something that is still working within the coordination level," Close said.

The decision to vest control of the experiments with the Atlantic Command differs from the recommendation of the National Defense Panel (NDP), a congressionally mandated group of experts empowered to assess long-range U.S. military needs.

"Rather than having a joint forces command as recommended by the NDP, we are giving [the job] to a warfighting CINC [commander in chief]." Close said.

The training duties would be added to a number of new missions that the command will take over Oct. 1. The Joint Staff has decided to transfer so-called Chairman Controlled Activities--functions now controlled by Joint Staff--to ACOM, including: the Joint Warfighting Center at Ft. Monroe, Va.; the Joint Command and Control Warfighting Center at Kelly AFB, Texas; the Joint Communications Support Element at Hurlburt Field, Fla.; the Joint Battle Center at Hampton, Va.; and the Joint Warfare Analysis Center at Dahlgren, Va.

Baltimore Sun May 13, 1998 Pg. 2

Military budgets, warfare waning

■ **Combat:** *Around the world, armed services expenditures and conflicts are declining, but the United States remains the single largest spender.*

By MICHAEL RENNER
WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE

The end of the Cold War and of several regional and local hot wars in recent years has brought military expenditures down in many countries. By a preliminary estimate, world military expenditures fell by 4 percent in 1996, to $701 billion. They are now 39 percent below the peak of $1.1 trillion that they reached in 1984. Relative to global economic output, military spending stands at 2.6 percent, down from 5.7 percent in the mid-1980s.

The quality and reliability of information made available by national governments are still poor. Many governments, China prominent among them, reveal only a portion of relevant items in the budgets of civilian agencies.

As a consequence, military budget watchers report widely different figures. For 1995, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency puts global spending at $865 billion, the International Institute for Strategic Studies says the figure is $828 billion, but the Bonn International Conversion Center pegs it at $728 billion.

Most uncertain are Russian and Chinese expenditures. Given its methodology, the ACDA tends to inflate these outlays; for Russia, it relies on estimates of what it would cost in the United States, in dollars, to outfit and maintain Russia's military. For China, it uses purchasing power estimates of the Chinese yuan. Even if reliable local currency expenditure estimates were available, converting these into dollars, applying proper exchange rates, creates more problems.

For 1995, the ACDA pegs Russian spending at $76 billion and Chinese expenditures at $63.5 billion. The IISS believes the figures are $82 billion and $33 billion, respectively. Trying to correct for the problems just mentioned, the BICC puts Russia's budget at a mere $13 billion, perhaps too low, and China's at $34 billion.

But there is no disputing that the single largest spender by far is the United States. According to the Pentagon's National Defense Budget Estimates, which provides more recent data than in other countries, U.S. outlays came to $243 billion, or 35 percent of global military expenditures, in 1997. Besides the United States, Russia and China, other big spenders (in 1995) include Japan ($43.9 billion), France ($43.1 billion), Germany ($37.8 billion) and the United Kingdom ($33.9 billion) — all close allies of the United States.

A third tier of military spenders includes Italy ($19.8 billion), Saudi Arabia ($16.8 billion), South Korea ($13.6 billion), Taiwan ($12.6 billion) and Canada ($10.7 billion).

They are followed by India ($9.8 billion), Switzerland ($8.2 billion), Australia ($8.1 billion), Spain ($7.7 billion), Israel ($7.5 billion), the Netherlands ($7.1 billion), Turkey ($6.1 billion) and North Korea ($5.6 billion). All other countries spend less than $5 billion a year on their militaries. Among the top 20 military spenders, only North Korea is hostile toward Western countries.

The number of armed conflicts in the world is also declining.

There were 25 armed conflicts in 1997, and half the peak number of 51 recorded during 1992. These data are collected by the Unit for the Study of Wars, Armaments and Development at the University of Hamburg in Germany.

Other analysts report slightly different numbers. The Conflict Data Project at the University of Uppsala, Sweden, for example, puts the peak in 1992 at 55 and pegs the number of conflicts in 1997 at 24. Discrepancies are due to definitional and methodological questions, along with the frequent lack of reliable information. Though the numbers in the analysis that follows are frequently inconsistent, the trends are reliable.

From 1989 to 1996, there were a total of 101 armed conflicts. Ninety-five took place among combatants within countries rather than between states. This is reflected in the large number of conflict parties — 254 in all, including government armies, paramilitary forces, guerrilla bands, drug warlords and others.

An estimated 250,000 children are serving as soldiers, often against their will. Children under 18 years old were among the combatants in 33 current or recent conflicts, while 26 involved children younger than 15. In 1995, Project Ploughshares in Canada found that children participated in fighting in more than 80 percent of the countries that were at war during the year.

Although the number of conflicts is high, few of them are full-fledged wars, killing more than 1,000 persons per year. Most are "intermediate" armed conflicts (fewer than 1,000 deaths in any one year) or "minor" ones (fewer than 1,000 deaths during the conflict). During 1996, there were 17 minor conflicts, 13 intermediate ones and six wars. By contrast, as recently as 1989, the respective numbers were 15, 14 and 18.

Of the 101 conflicts between 1989 and 1996, two-thirds had ended by the close of 1996. Conflict ter-

mination was due to one party's victory in 23 cases, the result of a peace agreement in 19, and halted by a cease-fire in seven. In the remaining 17 cases, fighting simply ebbed away, and it is unclear whether the violence is gone for good or whether hostilities might resume. (A conflict is considered terminated if there is no fighting for at least one year.)

Many of the active conflicts have lasted many years, although in some cases fighting is sporadic. Most were initiated during the 1970s and 1980s, but some, like the violence in Myanmar, originated in the 1940s.

More than half of the 19 peace agreements reached from 1989 to 1996 were achieved in Africa. Four agreements were concluded in the Americas, three in Europe and one each in the Middle East and Asia. Most of the conflicts since 1989 in the latter two regions remain unresolved.

Yet every region has seen a reduction in warfare since 1992. Of the 36 conflicts in 1996, 14 were in Asia, 14 in Africa, five in the Middle East, two in the Americas and one in Europe. In 1996, the heaviest fighting took place in Afghanistan, Algeria, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Turkey.

But the number of armed conflicts alone is not a sufficient indicator of the loss of human life or the disruption of societies. A single major conflict might cause far greater suffering than a large number of small ones.

During the first half of the 1990s, at least 3.2 million people died of war-related causes — either due to fighting or to hunger and disease caused by the fighting. This is one of the highest death tolls of any five-year period since the end of World War II. Since 1946, at least 25 million people have been killed.

Some analysts contend that the number is far higher. According to Milton Leitenberg of the University of Maryland, it might be as high as 44 million. Civilians account for a growing share of the victims, rising from 14 percent in World War I to 67 percent in World War II, 75 percent in the 1980s, and 90 percent in the 1990s.

Baltimore Sun
May 13, 1998
Pg. 4

Bias charge stalls pick for top Navy chaplain

Clinton nominee allegedly passed over officer from rival Lutheran group

By TOM BOWMAN
SUN NATIONAL STAFF

WASHINGTON — Allegations of religious discrimination against President Clinton's choice to be the chief of Navy chaplains has stalled the nomination in the Senate Armed Services Committee until the Pentagon can review the matter.

The nominee, Rear Adm. A. Byron Holderby, presided over an officers' promotion board in 1996 that was found to have discriminated against a Lutheran chaplain, Lt. Cmdr. Stan M. Aufderheide, according to a review by the Navy's anti-discrimination officer. But the Navy's inspector general later found the allegations "unsubstantiated," and Holderby was nominated for the top chaplain's post last month.

Aufderheide claims that Holderby engineered his rejection for commander because the two belong to competing Lutheran factions. Holderby was ordained in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the nation's largest Lutheran group, which is relatively liberal. Aufderheide belongs to the second-largest group, the more traditional Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

Holderby, 63, who has two Legions of Merit and a career that has taken him from the Vietnam War to aircraft carriers and Marine commands, was unavailable for comment.

Rear Adm. Tom Jurkowsky, a Navy spokesman, said "the Navy has been very, very fair" in the matter. The anti-discrimination review by Capt. Joseph N. Stafford, which concluded that Aufderheide had been "improperly denied promotion," was not as thorough as the naval inspector general's report, Jurkowsky said.

But Sen. John Glenn of Ohio, a Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, and two Florida senators say the IG report may have been flawed. Glenn asked the committee to postpone a vote on Holderby until the Defense Department's inspector general can review the case.

Omitted evidence

The Navy IG's report that cleared Holderby did not include evidence that raises questions about the board. One board member believed that an unnamed officer had been "passed over due to denominational discrimination," according to a transcript of interviews obtained by *The Sun*.

Also, the IG's report did not include "the bias in the selection process" cited in the anti-discrimination report, Sens. Bob Graham and Connie Mack of Florida said in a letter to the Pentagon urging a review. Some officers with "relatively weak records" were promoted over those with "far superior records," the letter said.

"We are concerned that the Navy's promotion selection process may not be serving the larger interests of the Navy," the two senators wrote.

Aufderheide, reached in Naples, Italy, where he is a chaplain on the staff of Adm. T. Joseph Lopez, commander in chief of U.S. naval forces in Europe, would not comment.

Last year, Lopez urged the creation of a special promotion board to reconsider Aufderheide, a Persian Gulf war veteran, calling him "one of the finest chaplains" and best officers he has known.

The commanders' promotion board led by Holderby, then deputy chief of chaplains, met in April 1996 and included five other members, four of whom were chaplains. Thirty-five lieutenant commanders were considered for commander; 20 were selected.

All four Evangelical Lutheran chaplains who were before the board were promoted to commander, while Aufderheide and another Missouri Synod member were passed over, according to Navy documents.

Seeking the 'best'

Holderby told fellow board members to seek the "best and fully qualified" and not consider a chaplain's denomination, according to the Navy IG report.

Aufderheide filed a request for a special promotion board and an equal opportunity complaint, charging that Holderby had pressed the other chaplains on the board "for his denomination over

those of other Lutherans."

But the Navy IG inquiry, led by Vice Adm. Lee F. Gunn, found that a chaplain's denomination had not been an issue in a promotion.

Holderby told the IG investigators that, while Aufderheide "has a very fine record, others do, too. We [the chaplain corps] have the lowest percentage of selection."

The report also noted that Aufderheide had been passed over by another commander's board in 1997, but did not file charges of discrimination then.

In the report's analysis, Gunn stated: "No board member or recorder recalled any conduct during the board on the part of Chaplain Holderby, or any other member, that could constitute denominational discrimination."

But the transcripts of the IG's interviews show that one unidentified board member said a "major sore point" concerned "the consideration of denomination."

"It was done 'with such finesse at one point' that this board member felt that 'one officer was passed over due to 'denominational considerations,'" according to the investigator's synopsis of the interview.

One Navy source said that was a reference not to Aufderheide but to another chaplain under consideration. The IG review saw this as a mere "perception" of a first-time board member and concluded that Holderby acted properly.

Washington Times May 13, 1998 Pg. 22

Incompetent leaders scapegoated Navy flight instructor

In response to Paul Craig Roberts' April 24 commentary, "Military tailspin over sexual politics," Navy Secretary John H. Dalton makes several assertions about my client, Lt. Patrick J. Burns, that are inaccurate and self-serving ("Women are serving proudly in the U.S. Navy," Letters).

As one of their instructors, Lt. Burns was acutely aware of the abilities and limitations of each of the first two women designated to fly the F-14 fighter plane. Within months of their graduation, Lt. Kara Hultgreen was killed tragically in an aircraft mishap caused primarily by pilot error — similar to mistakes she had made twice before. Lt. Carey Lohrenz was removed from carrier aviation for flight performance that was found by Navy investigators to be "undisciplined, unpredictable and unsafe" and that "scared everyone but her."

During their training, Lt. Burns repeatedly expressed his concerns about the safety and competence of these two pilots. He communicated his concerns directly to officers in his immediate chain of command and later to then-Rear Adm. Lyle Bien. His concerns were never conveyed to higher authorities — or, if they were, no action was taken. That is why it was necessary to seek the assistance of the Center for Military Readiness (CMR), a public-policy organization that succeeded in taking Lt. Burns' concerns to Congress and senior Navy officials.

Mr. Dalton's statement that Lt. Burns' actions violated the "law" is an intentional misrepresentation. There was a clear danger to civilian and military personnel, and the Privacy Act was not designed to prevent common-sense action that saves lives. The Privacy Act violation to which Mr. Dalton alludes is the proverbial "red herring," and his reliance on the alleged violation is misplaced and politically motivated. Public safety concerns must come first. Lt. Burns understood that priority.

Additionally, the documents that Lt. Burns released to CMR contained evidence of misconduct and abuse of authority by senior Navy officials. As such, they constituted a protected disclosure under the Whistleblower Protection Act. The clear purpose of the act is to protect service members who make or prepare to make a communication to proper authorities regarding improper official actions. The law does not require that a "whistleblower" make a disclosure in writing. Further, examples of case law demonstrate that disclosures made in the interest of public safety, even if relayed through a third party, such as a public-policy organization or member of the news media, are still viewed by the courts as protected disclosures.

To date, the Departments of the Navy and Defense have refused repeated requests for an independent inquiry to determine accountability for the Hultgreen tragedy and to recognize Lt. Burns' status as a whistleblower who acted selflessly, in compliance with Navy core values, to protect safety and excellence in naval aviation. Instead, Mr. Dalton has railroaded Lt. Burns by placing a formal letter of censure in Lt. Burns' permanent record and recommending that President Clinton remove his name from the 1998 lieutenant commander promotion list.

Numerous internal Navy investigations, unassailable documentary evidence and sworn witness testimony all confirm that my client had sound, legal reasons for his actions. Extraordinary and sometimes unprecedented concessions were extended to the women so they would not fail in training. Mr. Dalton condoned this practice even while knowing that it was costly, dangerous and demoralizing to all who were aware of it. The secretary failed to do anything substantive to correct these problems, and he tolerated unacceptable risks that contributed to the loss of a courageous aviator, Lt. Hultgreen.

Further, in the aftermath of Lt. Hultgreen's death, Mr. Dalton was a willing participant in a campaign of obfuscation as the leader of the Department of the Navy. He was also guilty of misleading the media, the public and members of Congress about the cause of the mishap and about the training and competence of some female aviators.

The issue here is not whether women serve proudly and well in our Navy, but whether special concessions and double standards in specialized military training should continue to compromise safety and increase risks to all aviators and carrier crew members.

The Navy inspector general conceded in 1997 that a "race" was on with the Air Force to get women into combat aviation. A fatal decision was made in Washington that the first two women to fly the F-14 would be allowed to graduate with multiple serious errors and minimal abilities that would have disqualified others. When the inevitable tragedy struck, Mr. Dalton's spokesmen issued news releases stating that engine failure was the primary cause. It wasn't.

ROBERT B. RAE
Virginia Beach

Editor's Note: The commentary referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 24, 1998, Pg. 12.

Baltimore Sun
May 13, 1998 Pg. 2C

Defense contractor jailed in defective parts case

A Paterson, N.J., defense contractor has been sentenced to three months in federal prison and three months of house arrest for trying to block an investigation of his sales of defective parts to the Navy, federal prosecutors said.

David Grimaldi Jr., owner of Grimco Pneumatic Corp., was convicted of selling defective parts for a cable system used to snare jets landing on aircraft carriers, said Alain Leibman, an assistant U.S. attorney in Newark, N.J.

The Navy recalled the equipment, and no injuries or damages were reported.

New York Times May 13, 1998

A Nuclear Threat From India

India's explosion of three nuclear devices in the Rajasthan desert makes the world a more dangerous place. By arrogantly challenging international efforts to control the spread of the most lethal weapons, the new Hindu nationalist Government of Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee may win applause at home from those who confuse military might with self-esteem. But for a paltry and short-lived domestic gain, India now faces a ruinous cutoff in foreign aid, a self-defeating arms race with Pakistan and isolation even from friends.

With an economy that is slowing down, India needs help to ease its crushing poverty and overcome its many ethnic divisions. Yet President Clinton has no choice, legally or morally, but to impose broad economic sanctions, as he said yesterday he would do. Such an action should include a ban on military sales and assistance, foreign aid and bank loans to the Government. Federal law also compels the United States to oppose loans and technical assistance from the World Bank and other financial institutions, which supply billions of dollars in credits vital to India's solvency.

Mr. Clinton has sought to improve relations with India and was planning to make the first Presidential visit to India in 20 years this fall. But he should now reconsider. India might still clear the way for a useful visit if it stopped testing and signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It could justify such a step by citing China and France, which tested nuclear weapons a few years ago, provoking an international outcry, and then declared they would sign the treaty. It was India's founding Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who first proposed such a treaty a generation ago, and it is not too late for India to redeem his vision. Pakistan has said it would sign if India goes along.

India has much to be proud of as the world's most populous democracy. But its bitter colonial legacy has made Indian leaders distrustful of outside powers, especially those with nuclear weapons that lecture others about nuclear restraint. India justifies its latest tests by citing the military threat from its neighbors to the north and west. But beyond minor border disputes, China has no hostile designs on India. It is deplorable that China has aided Pakistan with its military program, but Pakistan, with or without nuclear weapons, is more than matched by India's conventional and nuclear capacity. By testing a weapon now, India is likely to provoke Pakistan and plunge both sides into more arms programs that neither can afford.

Less than a decade after the end of the cold war, the gravest threat of nuclear war is now shaping up in South Asia. As if to show sensitivity to global opinion, Prime Minister Vajpayee indicated that India had not yet moved to convert its capability into actual weapons. Mr. Clinton should seek India's pledge to exercise restraint in developing nuclear warheads and in testing missiles capable of delivering them. He can also press China to stop the flow of technology to Pakistan and thus reassure India about its security concerns.

It is fashionable in some circles to say that India and Pakistan are capable of managing their nuclear relationship, just as the United States and the Soviet Union did throughout the cold war. But the superpowers were lucky to avoid a war in 1962, and they built up an elaborate regimen of safeguards to preserve the peace, which India and Pakistan lack. In the end, the Soviet Union collapsed under the weight of its efforts to keep up militarily. For India to avoid that fate, it must seek safety in arms control and restraint, not a nuclear buildup.

Washington Post May 13, 1998 Pg. 16

India's Nuclear Irresponsibility

INDIA'S NUCLEAR weapons tests assault the controlled nuclear universe the United States has been trying to build for 50 years. In this scheme, a handful of nuclear powers would ensure that others did not join the club, nor lose for not joining. It worked pretty well. Three other states -- India, Pakistan, Israel -- had moved toward nuclear status but paused short of full and declared membership. This is the arrangement India has now broken by its first testing -- this time unambiguously of weapons -- since 1974. The danger is that its defiance of global nonproliferation standards will stir others to follow suit.

An inexperienced Hindu nationalist government with great-power ambitions took office last month. In a setting of tension (of different sorts) with both regional rival Pakistan and strategic rival China, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee undertook to review nuclear policy and exercise India's long-available nuclear option if necessary. American officials asked New Delhi for "dialogue and discretion" and were told there was no "rush." These Indian assurances were overtaken even before the policy review was fairly launched. The Indian military-scientific complex made sure that inquiring American officials and satellites got no advance sign. The CIA heard the news from CNN.

Frightened Pakistan, fearful of being overwhelmed by giant India, had promised an "equal response" to an Indian nuclear surge. It now comes under immense domestic pressure to respect that unhappy pledge.

American law mandates early and severe economic sanctions against non-nuclear countries that test. President Clinton seemed to be suggesting yesterday, however, that first he wants to try to talk India into finally signing the pending test ban treaty, the very treaty for whose terms the Indians have just shown their contempt. It is important to get the order of events straight. India has taken a huge slam at the United States and at the whole global campaign of nonproliferation. Sanctions are a blunt instrument, but they have a punitive impact and are crucial to American credibility. It is not for Washington to take the global heat off India. It is for India, a nation supposedly otherwise bent on economic modernization, to find its own way back from its nuclear irresponsibility.

Baltimore Sun May 13, 1998 Pg. 1

Mikulski would keep shipbreaking in U.S.

Program would test scrapping vessels in American yards

By GARY COHN
SUN STAFF

Disappointed with the Defense Department's plans to improve its troubled ship-scrapping program, Sen. Barbara A. Mikulski introduced legislation yesterday to set up a pilot program to dismantle Navy vessels at U.S. shipyards.

The legislation also would ban the sale of Navy and Maritime Administration ships for scrapping in the Third World, where worker-safety and environmental regulations are virtually nonexistent.

"The way we do this [dis-

pose of old government vessels] is not being done in an honorable, environmentally sensitive, efficient way," Mikulski told the Senate.

"I believe when we have ships that have defended the United States of America, that they were floating military bases, they should be retired with honor."

The scrapping industry has compiled a record of deaths, accidents, mishandling of asbestos and environmental violations while dismantling Navy ships at ports around the country.

Last month, a Defense Department panel called for more rigorous management of the ship-scrapping program, including stepped-up inspections and clearer guidelines to shipbreaking firms.

But Mikulski said those suggestions did not go far enough. "The recommendations were more enforcement of the same old way of doing business," the Maryland Democrat said.

"Well, more enforcement of the same old way of doing business will still end up with the same old way of doing business: occupational safety dangers, environmental catastrophes and a national disgrace."

A spokeswoman for the Defense Department said yesterday that government agencies are reviewing the panel's recommendations.

She added that the Navy is drafting plans for a pilot program to determine more clearly the costs of scrapping warships.

The Defense Department's "goal is to ensure that vessels are scrapped in a manner that is environmentally sound, safe and economically feasible," said Army Lt. Col. Nancy Burt.

Meanwhile, Rep. Wayne T. Gilchrest, the Maryland Republican whose House maritime subcommittee held a hearing on the scrapping program in March, plans to hold another hearing early next month to determine whether the Defense Department reform recommendations are adequate.

Since 1991, as the Navy has downsized, the Defense Department has sold old warships to private contractors, who have tried to make a profit by selling salvaged metal.

But many contractors cut corners, leading to safety and environmental violations at U.S. ports, including Baltimore, *The Sun* reported in a series of articles in December.

Mikulski criticized the Defense Department for awarding vessels to shipbreakers with questionable records while yards with established track records were desperate for business.

She cited the scrapping of the USS Coral Sea in Baltimore, which has been marked by a disabling accident, repeated fires, mishandling of asbestos and polluting of the harbor.

"Right down the road was the Baltimore ... shipyard, the Bethlehem Steel shipyard that was foraging for work," she said on the Senate floor.

But instead, "They turned to the rogues, the crooks, the scum, the scam, to dismantle Navy ships."

Under her demonstration project, some old government vessels would be scrapped at two shipyards that have a record of safely handling asbestos and other hazardous materials.

The Defense Department would pay up-front costs — and then recoup those costs and share in any profits when the scrap is sold.

The contracts would run for three years.

The bill does not specify which shipyards would be eligible for the work, though it clearly seems to point to established yards such as the Baltimore area's Sparrows Point. Other possibilities include yards in Oregon and Massachusetts.

Baltimore Marine Industries Inc., the Sparrows Point shipyard formerly owned by Bethlehem Steel Corp., is eager to get shipbreaking work, workers and the yard's management have said — but only if the work is made safe for the yard's roughly 700 workers.

The legislation also deals with the thorny issue of whether Navy and Maritime Administration ships should be scrapped overseas.

The Navy and the Maritime Administration, which together have about 180 ships designated for scrapping, had suspended the controversial export plan while the Defense Department panel reviewed the way government ships are scrapped. In its report last month, the panel did not rule out scrapping ships overseas.

Mikulski's bill would ban the overseas scrapping of Navy and Maritime Administration vessels unless the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the secretary of labor certify that the nations where the yards are located enforce labor and environmental standards comparable to those in the United States.

The bill's co-sponsors, Democrats John Glenn of Ohio and Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland, said the U.S. government should not export its environmental problems to Third World nations.

"If we are going to export ships to be scrapped, then the destination country must have adequate environmental and labor safeguards," said Glenn. "That's currently not the case in many developing countries."

Most shipbreaking overseas is done on beachfront plots in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. In Alang, India, the largest shipbreaking center in the world, 35,000 men work and live in wretched conditions.

Death by accident and disease is an everyday occurrence.

Sun staff writer Sean Somerville contributed to this article.

New York Times May 13, 1998

A Blast Of Reality

By Henry Sokolski

WASHINGTON -- It may be difficult to acknowledge, but India's test of three nuclear devices on Monday morning was, among other things, an act of impatience with failed American efforts to stop China and North Korea from developing and spreading strategic weapons. "It is clear that by the time the Clinton Administration wakes up to the danger posed by the China-Pakistan-North Korean axis, it will be too late for India," The Times of India said on Tuesday.

None of this restiveness can justify India's action, which was self-defeating.

But it should sting for those still anxious to avoid the worst. Indeed, if the United States and its friends are to stem the spread of strategic weapons to Pakistan and beyond, we need to recognize that Monday's event was in no small part the result of an American nonproliferation policy so disjointed and concessionary that it was prone to be disregarded and misread.

White House officials admit they were caught flat-footed, that the Central Intelligence Agency failed to provide adequate warning of the tests.

To press this point, however, is to miss the warning the Administration had months earlier: the winter election of the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party, which had long championed India's right to nuclear weapons.

What did the White House do with this warning? It sent its United Nations Ambassador, Bill Richardson, to India to emphasize the importance of issues other than nonprolifera-

tion (lest it sour relations) as well as the chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Shirley Ann Jackson, to emphasize our desire for expanded nuclear cooperation.

Not surprisingly the Indian press interpreted these visits in the worst way possible. The United States, it argued, has finally gotten over its preoccupation with blocking India's rightful development of strategic technology.

What's unclear is when, if at all, American officials bothered to brief leaders of the Bharatiya Janata Party about the sanctions that the White House would be forced to impose if India followed through on its pledge.

What can we do now? The White House should immediately impose the sanctions called for in the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994, rather than bargain for some new pledge of restraint.

Indian officials speculate that the United States may not impose sanctions or that if it does they will have little effect. We must prove them wrong. In fact, the value of the Indian stock market had already fallen by 5 percent by Tuesday in anticipation of sanctions. The Indian financial market understands what sanctions will mean to the banks, which are seriously overextended and undercapitalized.

By Indian law, at least 51 percent of the shares of every bank are owned by the Government.

Under the American nonproliferation law, no United States bank, public or private, can make loans or extend credit to these institutions for at least one year. Carrying out the sanctions would hurt. But it would strengthen the hand of Indians who understand that their nation can best compete against China by being economically powerful and that without such strength, a military competition of the sort now being undertaken will be disastrous.

Certainly, the world is watching, including Pakistan (whose financial and political institutions can even less afford an American financial cut-off). If the White House is to have any chance of having its commitment to nonproliferation taken seriously, its sanctions must be seen as something more than a bluff.

Pakistan, at the least, must understand it has much more to lose than gain by testing.

Congress and the White House must also use the Indian tests to revise our overly generous, à la carte nonproliferation policies.

We must recognize that the case of India is related to those of China and North Korea: our catering to both these nation's demands for military-related technology -- whether it be for missile or nuclear goods -- is a prescription for more proliferation.

Indeed, the White House has smothered these nations and Russia with all manner of nuclear and space assistance (actually subsidizing known proliferators like China's Great Wall Industries, the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation and the Russian Space Agency with licensed American technology).

But what the United States has all too scrupulously avoided is the use of any sticks -- from enforcing sanctions against China and Russia, to penalizing Russian investments in Iran's oil industry, to keeping our military and diplomats from purposeful action against Iraq, to holding North Korea responsible for its continued violation of the global Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. This and the continued American export of high technology to known proliferators must end.

Finally, we need to be more confident. We always have plenty of warning, if we are willing to act on less than conclusive proof of a completed weapons program. And we have plenty of options to deter proliferation, assuming we're willing to act early enough.

Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Educa tion Center, was the top official for nuclear nonproliferation issues in the Bush Defense Department.

Washington Post May 13, 1998 Pg. 17

Nuclear Notice . . .

By Jim Hoagland

Atal Bihari Vajpayee comes right to the point. The new Indian prime minister burst onto the world stage this week by delivering a nuclear punch in the nose to the international community and then celebrating his dubious achievement on a religious festival day.

Other candidates for Polecat of the Month status were instantly left eating dust: The carefully cultivated "more in sorrow than in anger" defiance favored by Binyamjin Netanyahu, and the stiff, thuggish demeanor of Slobodan Milosevic, suddenly seemed old hat and less cataclysmic on Prime Minister Vajpayee's day of atomic glory.

The Israeli prime minister and Serbia's president had led the way in May in risking international condemnation to safeguard national interests they deem vital. But they have been restrained and thoughtful in their resistance to American pressure when contrasted to Vajpayee, leader of India's seven-month-old Hindu nationalist government.

True, they have toyed with Bill Clinton and Europe's democratically elected presidents and prime ministers. But Vajpayee has . . . well, the verb that comes to mind for what Vajpayee has done to them can't be published here, even in the post-Lewinsky era of American journalism.

The Indian leader chose a symbolically charged moment to order his country's first nuclear explosions since 1974. The three experimental underground blasts were carried out Monday near India's frontier with Pakistan, which immediately indicated it will now defy international pressure and test its own nuclear device.

Vajpayee struck just as the leaders of the world's seven most affluent industrial democracies, joined by their poor but militarily powerful Russian cousins, were preparing to assemble in Birmingham, England, for their annual two-day parley about the state of the world.

These talks, now known as the G-7, the G-8 or the G-Whatever, have become the ultimate BOGSAT (Bunch of Guys Sitting Around a Table). These talks are no longer about power. They are about the illusion of power, created and sustained in the summit's press releases and wall-to-wall puffery.

Vajpayee punctured that illusion of power with nuclear blasts the CIA-DIA-NSA $25 billion a year gadgetry did not spot being prepared and which the world leaders were relatively confident would not happen now. After all, they had issued stern warnings to both India and Pakistan about the consequences of sparking a nuclear arms race in the Asian subcontinent.

But in a clear hint that the great powers are not so great now, Vajpayee seems to have been oblivious to the timing of their summit. He chose May 11 because it fell on the same Buddhist festival day as the first Indian test in 1974, John F. Burns reported in the New York Times. Vajpayee announced the explosions in a sparse six-sentence declaration, after which he took no questions from reporters.

The big question he did not answer is why, or at least, why now. The answer seems to be political rather than military.

The Indian leader is not about to attack Pakistan or China, the two nations his government has identified as military threats. Instead, he moves to bolster his Hindu nationalist party's standing with an electorate that welcomed the tests, as Kenneth J. Cooper reported in The Washington Post.

Vajpayee also probably calculates that becoming a declared nuclear power ultimately boosts India's chance to gain a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council and win entry to other international power groups.

Would the G-7 have bent their rules and framework to bring Russia halfway into their meetings -- the finance ministers now meet a week before the heads of government to avoid sitting down with their Russian counterpart -- if Moscow was not the world's second greatest nuclear power? I somehow doubt it.

The five permanent members of the Security Council

(the P-5 in diplospeak) have exactly one thing in common: They all possess nuclear weapons. Vajpayee has stiffed the P-5's nonproliferation appeal, which much of the Third World sees as self-dealing pablum. India has sounded a nuclear knock on the P-5 door.

Mr. Vajpayee is an inconvenient fellow in another important aspect: America's strenuous effort to halt the spread of nuclear weapons has been based to a great extent on legitimate fears that a rogue regime headed by a dictator would unleash a global crisis by actually using these things.

India is the world's largest democracy. Vajpayee is neither rogue (in this sense) nor dictator. He is, for better or worse, an expression of India's collective political judgment. The same can be said for Israel's Netanyahu, who has undeclared but real nuclear weapons in his hip pocket.

Vajpayee's nuclear decision is shocking and reprehensible. But it should deliver two needed reminders to Clinton & Colleagues at Birmingham: Power is about will, not words and illusions. And selective nonproliferation is a hard case to make.

. . . To Be Ignored?

By Michael Kelly

The end of the American Century is a hungry time, filled with small nations aching with desire to be larger than they are. Inside every skinny power there is a fat one screaming to be let out, and from Beijing to Moscow to Baghdad to Tehran to Istanbul to New Delhi, ambitious souls dream tin-pot dreams of a new world order that is not the American Century II.

And the ambitious do more than dream. They build and they buy. For a commendably long time, the United States more or less kept the wraps on the weapons of mass destruction that it invented to win the great fight between democracy and totalitarianism. Five nations -- the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France -- declaredly possessed the bomb, and three others -- India, Pakistan and Israel -- possessed it but did not formally admit so. They did not because the United States applied immense pressure to anyone exhibiting nuclear ambition. But when the great fight ended, that pressure began to ease.

Now, the wraps are nearly completely off. The historians who chronicle the next century's wars will look back on the Clinton era as the age of proliferation, a sort of Great Awakening of nuclear ambition, when the power to deliver mass death (whether by means nuclear, chemical or biological) was allowed to spread from the few to the many.

A case can be made that there is not much that could have stopped this. The territorial and even imperial ambitions that the Cold War froze were bound to thaw, and as they thawed, they were bound to expand. But if something could have been done, this administration certainly didn't do it. The business community wouldn't have approved, and the new Democratic Party fashioned by Ron Brown and Bill Clinton is not anymore in the business of irritating business. Commerce rules, and nowhere has this been more clear, and with more disastrous results, than in the area of nuclear proliferation.

For years, the administration has looked the other way from increasingly blatant violations of proliferation restrictions by China, Russia, and various European companies. It has done so, as the president recently hinted in unusually candid remarks, because it does not wish to admit truths that would trigger anti-proliferation sanctions that might get in the way of trade.

But the problem with proliferation is that it proliferates. Just because the United States chooses to look the other way doesn't mean that everyone else is blind, and nations that find themselves directly threatened by the expansiveness of others tend to be very watchful indeed. While the administration was busy assuring itself, and Congress, that the new, good-neighborly People's Republic of China was nothing to worry about, India noticed a few things. It noticed that Tibet was next door; and it noticed that China continued to occupy Tibet; and it noticed that China had deployed nuclear missiles in Tibet; and it noticed that China had recently improved its missile capacities, thanks to Clinton administration assistance; and it noticed that China had never renounced its claim to a swath of eastern India.

On May 3, India's defense minister, George Fernandes, appeared on television. He said that "China has its nuclear weapons stockpiled in Tibet right along India's borders," and that "China is potential threat No. 1." Recalling India's brief and humiliating 1962 border war with China, he said that his country had in the past made the mistake of failing to recognize China's territorial intentions, and that it was not going to make the mistake again. Of India's long-standing low-profile nuclear policy, he said, pointedly: "We believe we need to make a review of the defense policy."

The review didn't take long. On Monday, India, which had not exploded a nuclear weapon since May 1974, detonated three devices under the desert ground about 70 miles from the Pakistan border. The White House said that it was surprised, which is doubtless true. Pakistan, which fears India as India fears China, said it was deeply concerned. But not to worry. Pakistan has its nuclear program too, a program that has received lots of assistance in recent years from China, assistance that the White House did not notice -- officially.

Now, three nuclear bomb blasts later, the president is suddenly "deeply disturbed," and he says he will punish India by enforcing the sanctions called for under the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994, which mandates that the United States stop aid and credit to a nation that behaves as India has. Only a few weeks ago the president was grousing about how sanctions laws force him to "fudge" reality and issue waivers. But there will be no fudging and waivering this time. Of course that may be because this particular law does not allow waivers.

Michael Kelly is a senior writer for National Journal.

Washington Times May 13, 1998 Pg. 23

Our stake in Asia's nuclear future

By Lee H. Hamilton

The specter of an active North Korean nuclear weapons problem —the stuff of diplomatic nightmares — has returned. Where we once believed we had safely contained the North Korean nuclear threat, that communist country now accuses the United States of welching on the deal. They are now threatening to scrap the crucial agreement that has frozen North Korea's weapons program for the past four years.

The 1994 Agreed Framework with North Korea is one of the unsung success stories of the Clinton presidency. Because of that agreement, North Korea has shut down its only operating nuclear reactor, and halted construction on two new reactors. It has refrained from reprocessing spent fuel rods, which would have produced enough plutonium for four or five nuclear weapons. It has safely stored those rods under U.S. and international inspection. It has closed its reprocessing facility — even though the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty

permits reprocessing. Without reprocessing, the North will not be able to obtain plutonium for nuclear weapons.

Today, however, the Agreed Framework faces a crisis. Under that agreement, the U.S. pledged to arrange shipments of 500,000 metric tons of heavy fuel oil a year to North Korea until two proliferation-resistant light water reactors are constructed to generate electric power for the North. An international consortium, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, or KEDO, was created to implement this agreement. For the past three years, KEDO has kept the Agreed Framework — and North Korea's nuclear freeze — intact.

But KEDO is woefully short of funds. It costs $60-65 million a year to provide North Korea with the fuel oil stipulated in the Agreed Framework. This year, Congress appropriated $30 million for this purpose. While Europe will help make up the difference, KEDO still must use this year's funds to pay off old debt ($47 million) because of past shortfalls. Unless it can raise additional money, KEDO cannot carry out its part of the Agreed Framework. If denied the oil promised, North Korea will have little incentive to honor its end of the bargain or maintain its nuclear freeze.

An end to North Korea's nuclear freeze would have grave consequences for American interests — and peace and stability — throughout East Asia. It would return us to the unworkable situation we faced in 1994, when our only options appeared to be moving forward with economic sanctions that no one believed would work, or launching air strikes against possible nuclear stockpiles.

To head off such a setback, the administration should press our Asian partners, who after all have at least as much at stake as we do, to work with us to restore the financial health of KEDO and the Agreed Framework.

South Korea. We should encourage South Korea's new government, even though it faces a tough financial situation, to state publicly its intention to live up to its predecessor's pledge to play "the central role" in financing the light water reactor project in North Korea. South Korea should also unequivocally state in public what has already been hinted — that "the central role" means that Seoul will pay, over the length of the project, 70 percent of the $5.2 billion cost. A forthright statement of this nature will go far in persuading Japan to meet its own responsibilities.

Japan. The U.S. should urge Japan not only to firm up its commitment to provide $1 billion for the light water reactor project but, more immediately, to help with KEDO's current expenses. Specifically, Japan should release to KEDO the $19 million it earlier put up as collateral for KEDO loans, and which it is now threatening to take back. Japan has contributed only $16.5 million to KEDO, a figure that in no way corresponds to its stake in regional stability.

China. So far, China has followed a hands-off approach to KEDO, even though it has helped with the North Korean nuclear problem in other respects. We should now press China to contribute to KEDO or, failing that, to acquiesce in Taiwan's participation.

North Korea. Secretary of State Albright and her colleagues should make clear that North Korea, too, must do more to help KEDO. North Korea's bluster and intransigence make it hard for democratic parliaments to vote money for oil shipments to North Korea. For this agreement to succeed, North Korea must cool its rhetoric and enter into a genuine dialogue with South Korea.

The United States. Finally, President Clinton must take a more visible leadership role and articulate the merits of his Korean policy. The president and the secretary of state must persuade Congress that the Agreed Framework is working, that KEDO deserves funding, and that this is a very high priority for peace and stability in Asia.

A nursery rhyme tells how, for want of a nail, a kingdom was lost. KEDO is the nail that holds together the international effort to block North Korea's nuclear ambitions. It would be a severe setback for our interests, and those of our Asian friends, if the international community let KEDO fail. We might discover that we have lost not a kingdom, but our best opportunity to keep nuclear weapons from the world's last Stalinist regime.

Rep. Lee H. Hamilton of Indiana is the ranking Democrat on the International Relations Committee.

Washington Post May 13, 1998 Pg. 17

Justice After Genocide

By Norman Dorsen
and Morton H. Halperin

Fifty years after Nuremberg and the drafting of the Genocide Convention, a diplomatic conference will convene in Rome in June to complete work on a treaty to create a permanent International Criminal Court. The court's mission will be to bring to justice those who commit war crimes, genocide or other crimes against humanity when the judicial system of their state is not capable of doing so.

The most serious roadblock in the way of the success of the Rome conference is the insistence thus far by the United States that it must be able to veto any effort to investigate an American. To ensure beyond all doubt that no American can be tried by the ICC, the Clinton administration is insisting that there be an affirmative vote of the U.N. Security Council -- subject to a veto by the five permanent members -- before the court's prosecutors can begin an investigation. The United States also has not yet taken a position on a controversial clause that would include requiring the country of which a person is a citizen to consent before the person could be investigated and indicted.

These American positions are entirely unnecessary to protect Americans from a frivolous or inappropriate indictment by the court, and they are inconsistent with the creation of an effective court. If the consent of the state of which the person was a citizen were required, then President Tudjman of Croatia could veto the indictment of any Croatian no matter how heinous his crimes. If a U.N. Security Council resolution were required, China could veto the indictment of Pol Pot, and Russia could prevent the investigation of any Serb atrocities in the former Yugoslavia.

Not only would these provisions cripple the court, they are unnecessary as well. No one wants this court to deal with routine crimes or to second-guess the decisions of functioning judicial systems. Rather, its mandate is strictly limited to genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Moreover, the jurisdiction of the court is limited by what is known as the concept of complementarity. That is, the court has jurisdiction only when the courts of the state with jurisdiction are not functioning or there is an unwillingness by the authorities to investigate and take whatever action is appropriate. Nevertheless, it might be wise to strengthen the provisions that ensure that a state -- such as the United States -- with functioning courts and impartial justice can contest before an impartial panel any suggestion that the International Criminal Court has jurisdiction over American citizens.

Critics of the court also object to the creation of a permanent court on the grounds that the court could someday end up directing the U.S. military to arrest those indicted. The court would have no such power. All

states would be required to apprehend any indicted war criminals within their territory as they are now required to do both under the principle of universal jurisdiction and under bilateral extradition treaties, but there would be no obligation on the part of the United States to send its troops abroad in search of those indicted. Even now in Bosnia, NATO has determined for itself when it will use force to arrest indicted war criminals.

No one wants a repeat of the Ottawa process, which led to a land mines treaty endorsed by most of the world community but not the United States. But if the administration holds to its current positions, that could well happen. The broad coalition of states working for an effective treaty will not and should not accept the current American positions.

President Clinton has been in the forefront of the effort to create an effective International Criminal Court. He needs to convince members of the military that their fears that a runaway court would indict Americans in violation of the treaty procedures and standards are misplaced, and he should order changes that would send the U.S. delegation to Rome with a mandate to lead the effort to create an effective court.

Despite the promise of Nuremberg and the Genocide Convention that the world community would take responsibility for preventing genocide and other crimes against humanity, we all stood by and let it happen again in Cambodia, in Rwanda, in Bosnia and elsewhere.

We need mechanisms for more effective interventions when such threats loom, but we also need an effective legal system to deter those who would contemplate such horrendous crimes and to punish those who commit them. The goal of creating an effective permanent International Criminal Court is within reach. We should not permit this historic opportunity to fail.

Norman Dorsen is a law professor at New York University and chairman of the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. Morton H. Halperin is senior vice president of the Century Foundation/Twentieth Century Fund.

Los Angeles Times May 12, 1998

Excess Bases Hobble U.S. Might

The Pentagon has repeatedly warned that keeping unneeded military bases open steals resources urgently needed for equipment and troops. The warning continues to fall on deaf ears in Congress. The Senate Armed Services Committee has rejected a compromise plan for one further round of base closings, to begin in 2001. That leaves the Defense Department with the unpleasant choice of watching the nation's military effectiveness decline or using a form of guerrilla warfare to try to shift funds away from the redundant bases. For now the odds seem to favor the latter course.

Defense Secretary William Cohen, with the support of the service chiefs, has already warned that some facilities might just be allowed to deteriorate, with money for maintenance and repairs withheld. Cohen recognizes the harshness of this approach and the effect it would have on the civilian and military work force at the bases. But a Congress that refuses to take the politically uncomfortable but necessary step of authorizing further base closings invites such a policy. At stake is up to $20 billion that could be more wisely spent to support the armed forces in their missions. That money has to come from somewhere, and redundant bases, relics of the Cold War, are the logical source.

A congressionally approved plan for an orderly new round of base closings could, as in the past, provide federal aid to cushion the impact on affected areas. But an approach that simply withholds spending for certain facilities carries no safety net, even though its economic impact might be severe. Congressional opponents of base closings, who profess to be concerned about the well-being of their constituents, may in fact be assuring that some of those constituents are fated to suffer real hardships.

No one in Congress has made a plausible national security case for preserving bases that the armed services have identified as unneeded and wasteful. Congress opposes more closings because they are politically unpopular and, in the case of Republicans, because President Clinton clumsily sought for his own political purposes to soften the impact of a major base closing in vote-rich California in 1995.

But none of this has anything to do with the needs of the military and the missions Congress expects it to carry out. It's most curious that senators who voted recently to enlarge NATO -- and in the process America's overseas defense commitments -- should forget that.

Chicago Tribune May 12, 1998

Missing-Missiles Mystery Cleared Up

In any complex business or policymaking environment, symbols have an inevitable appeal. But in some cases, they can obfuscate rather than clarify. Recent stories suggesting that the U.S. Department of Defense cannot keep track of its assets or expenditures (Perspective, April 19) are a case in point.

Reports that the Pentagon had "lost" an Army missile launcher and 200 Air Force cruise missiles were not true. The issue in both instances was lack of up-to-date paperwork. It's like being accused of losing your car if you don't have your ownership title at hand.

The missile launcher, which has a serial number, was mounted on a vehicle with its own serial number. Both the launcher and the vehicle had been listed under the vehicle's serial number. Ultimately, the two were sent to separate destinations--the vehicle to Pennsylvania, the launcher to New Mexico. Because the property records had both still listed under the same serial number, the property records did not disclose the new location of the launcher. But the Army can identify its new location in New Mexico by using a separate serial number.

Neither were the 200 cruise missiles ever missing. Records of critical weapons systems such as these are maintained in more than one database system. The missiles, which had been destroyed in compliance with a treaty with the former Soviet Union, had properly been deleted from two of the three databases that maintain records on cruise missiles, although that fact had not yet been reflected in the third. Those responsible in the Defense Department knew the missiles had been destroyed.

The Pentagon needs to improve its finance and accounting systems. We are working hard to do just that, but the task is daunting.

Because of the Pentagon's unique requirements and size, we have many different and overlapping systems. We know we have too many, and we've been taking steps to eliminate and consolidate those systems. In 1993, there were 324 separate finance and accounting systems in the Department of Defense. We have cut that number by more than half, and by 2003 we will cut it to 32--coordinated by the new Defense Finance and Accounting Service, which centralized the Department's finance and accounting functions in to a single agency. Consolidating finance and accounting systems and operations will reduce the number of inconsistencies and communication problems that led to some of the past record-keeping errors.

We are also upgrading the financial systems that are needed to support new accounting standards. For 200 years, the primary purpose of military accounting systems was to en-

sure that appropriated funds were spent as Congress directed. This resulted in a focus on information central to budget decisions, but not adequate for commercial-type accounting. In recent years, Congress and the executive branch directed the implementation of new federal-wide accounting standards and required auditable financial statements.

We are strongly committed to ensuring that these reforms allow us to meet the new requirements to provide auditable financial statements.

William Lynn
Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller), Chief financial officer
U.S. Department of Defense.

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 20, 1998, Pg. 20.

European Stars & Stripes May 12, 1998 Pg. 4

AF Launches Satellite

CAPE CANAVERAL, Fla. — The Air Force launched a rocket carrying a spy satellite Friday night.

Air Force officials refused to provide any information about the satellite, except to say that it was for the National Reconnaissance Office.

It was the third launch of the upgraded Titan 4B rocket, built by Lockheed Martin Corp. The launch team had to cope with a number of last-minute problems: a stray ship and sailboat, a malfunctioning computer and antenna receiver, and high wind.

From staff and wire reports

Chicago Tribune May 12, 1998

Training For A Coed Military

After the trauma of the 1991 Tailhook scandal, the Navy was the first service forced to get serious about sexual harassment and coercion in the ranks, and from all appearances it did its best. While the Army and Air Force were in the spotlight in recent years with sexual misconduct allegations and courts-martial, the Navy stayed relatively free of embarrassment.

That has now changed. In the last three months, five instructors at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center, which provides basic training to all Naval enlistees, have been accused of improper relations with recruits. This week, the Navy's inspector general came out to investigate.

It would be unfair to the individuals accused to equate allegations with guilt. It would also be unfair to the many able petty officers at Great Lakes to assume the base has a problem with sexual harassment of female recruits by instructors. It typically has fewer than 10 proven cases of misconduct a year--while handling 50,000 recruits annually.

A broader mistake would be to conclude that the services should stop integrating men and women in basic training. Last week, the House National Security Committee voted to require just that.

Women have become a key part of the military. Men and women have to work together in the Navy (and the Army and Air Force), which means they must learn how to cope with the pressures of close contact with the opposite sex. Since 60 percent of the recruits trained at Great Lakes go straight to ship assignments, basic training is the logical place for them to get those lessons.

Congress should defer to the wisdom of a presidential panel headed by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker, which last year proposed that male and female trainees be housed in separate barracks and conduct only some of their training in single-sex units, leaving at least half of the training to be done with mixed sexes. Defense Secretary William Cohen says separate barracks are too costly given the tight Pentagon budget, but he has ordered improvements in physical barriers and monitoring to block inappropriate contact.

The alleged problems at Great Lakes, however, seem to stem from abuse of authority, not coed housing. If the charges are proved, they need to be addressed with better selection and training of instructors and stern penalties for those who exploit their positions of trust. Giving up on integrated training is not a solution--it's just a way of relocating the problem.

Washington Times May 13, 1998 Pg. 8

Inside Politics

Compiled by Greg Pierce

No comment

Ken Bacon, assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, yesterday declined to comment on a Weekly Standard story implicating him in the improper release of personnel information about Pentagon employee Linda R. Tripp.

According to the story, Mr. Bacon directed a subordinate to release the information to a writer for the New Yorker magazine.

The story also suggested that Mr. Bacon was taking his cue from the White House.

Mrs. Tripp's tape recordings of talks with Monica Lewinsky are at the heart of the White House sex-and-lies scandal. Miss Lewinsky, a former White House intern who claims to have had an 18-month affair with Mr. Clinton, was transferred to Mr. Bacon's staff as a "confidential assistant" after Clinton aides became alarmed at her closeness to the president.

Following orders from Mr. Bacon, a Pentagon spokesman disclosed to the New Yorker that Mrs. Tripp once asserted on an employment form that she had never been arrested. The writer contrasted that assertion with a report that Mrs. Tripp had once been arrested as a teen-ager.

A Pentagon inquiry was dropped when the arrest turned out to be the result of a juvenile prank gone awry. Attention has now shifted to those in the Pentagon who were involved in releasing the personnel information.

European Stars & Stripes May 13, 1998 Pg. 3

U.S. troops keep helping to dig out southern Italy

By Ward Sanderson
Staff Writer

NAPLES, Italy — Americans continued to help dig out southern Italy on Tuesday, as more than 50 sailors and Marines from Naples joined a smaller Air Force disaster unit in the small town of Siano.

Meanwhile, 20 Seabees hauled excavated dirt away from Quindici and a Navy helicopter from Sigonella flew in a bulldozer to push mud away from a bridge in Casserta as a safety precaution. The Air Force workers — the Red Horse unit from Aviano Air Base — will stay until Sunday, said 1st Lt. John Haynes, an Aviano spokesman. Haynes said Italian authorities asked for the group's help.

Red Horse — an acronym for Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operations Repair Squadron Engineer — also helped the Italians after earthquakes rocked Assisi last year. The group in Siano was there primarily to dig out roads and some homes, said Lt. Jeff Gordon, a spokesman for the Navy bases in Naples.

Last week's slide killed five people there, he said. The Bobcat equipment used by the Red Horse team is designed to squeeze into tight areas, not for deep, heavy digging.

Charleston (SC) Post & Courier May 12, 1998

Spence: U.S. military `in trouble'

DEFENSES DOWN: In a speech to local business and military leaders Monday, the congressman said the nation's military is unprepared for multiple, simultaneous conflicts.

By Terry Joyce of the
Post and Courier staff

The U.S. military - what's left of it - is doing a good job, but it needs to speak out on recent cuts that have gone too deep, the chairman of the House National Security Committee said Monday.

"Our national strategy is to be able to (simultaneously) fight and win two major regional contingencies," said 2nd District Rep. Floyd Spence, R-S.C. "But we've cut back so much since Desert Storm (the Persian Gulf War) that I don't think we could do even one."

Spence spoke to about 150 local business and military leaders during a Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce breakfast on the aircraft carrier Yorktown at Patriot's Point. The occasion kicked off Armed Forces Week in the Lowcountry.

"People look to the Pentagon, the secretary of defense, the commander in chief for guidance," Spence said. "They keep telling us, `We're going to be all right,' but I believe we're in trouble.

"The military of today is stretched too thin. We're in an `in-between-the-wars' syndrome," he said.

Spence is chairman of the same committee that the late Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-Charleston, headed. Rivers died in December 1970, a few weeks after Spence was first elected to Congress.

"I've seen good budgets and bad budgets in those 28 years," Spence said, "but I've never been more concerned than I am now. It's becoming a hollow military.

"We were unprepared for World War II and Korea, and it wound up costing us hundreds of thousands of lives. I recently told the (Joint Chiefs of Staff) that they have to assume a lot of responsibility for not speaking out on our lack of preparedness. It's a sad state of affairs."

Later, Spence told The Post and Courier that he believed recent statements by Air Force chief of staff Gen. Michael Ryan favoring four to six "superbases" were simply another way of boosting Pentagon chief William Cohen's call for another round of base closures.

"I don't know if Charleston (Air Force Base) would be one of the four bases left or not," he said, "but I think (the superbases idea) is a part of Cohen's base closures theme. Cohen is calling for a BRAC (base closure process) in 2001 to 2005, but how's that going to save any money now?

"I don't think Congress will go along with it," Spence added.

Earlier, Spence told his audience that the nation is in jeopardy because of serious defense gaps.

"If Boris Yeltsin calls the president and says that someone in Russia has launched an ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) by accident, we can't handle it," Spence said. "People don't realize that we have absolutely no defense against that type of threat."

The same applies to missiles that China may have targeted against the United States, plus other weapons of mass destruction that other nations may be able to launch.

"We can't defend ourselves against even one such weapon," Spence said. He linked the shortfalls to a prolonged period of cuts in military spending and a misguided policy relating to treaties we signed with the former Soviet Union.

"In the last decade, we've cut our active-duty Army from 18 divisions to 10, our combat (tactical) aircraft by 40 percent, our bomber fleet by 59 percent and our combat ships by 35 percent.

"Our (Army) chief of staff said it would take us nine months just to retrain our troops coming back from Bosnia," he said. "But the threats are still out there."

The wholesale cuts in defense have led to other problems, such as shortages in recruiting and retention. Both the Air Force and the Navy are losing seasoned pilots because the smaller number of forces are being forced to do more work, especially overseas.

"People don't think about the threats," Spence said, perhaps because the threats are too horrible to think about.

"I'm tired of fighting to get our people (in the Pentagon) to do their job," he said. "I appeal to you to encourage your people in Congress to stand up for the military."

Terry Joyce may be reached at 745-5857.

Fayetteville (NC) Observer-Times May 12, 1998

Gen. Porr denies charges

By David Ammons
The Associated Press

A Fort Bragg general on Monday denied that he sexually harassed a civilian lawyer under his command at another post and said he did not suggest any retaliation aimed at discrediting her.

Brig. Gen. Darrel Porr, now the commanding general of the 44th Medical Brigade at Fort Bragg, told a federal jury in Tacoma, Wash., that he did not try to kiss Kelly Theriot, did not make sexual advances or suggestive comments to her and did not stroke or rub her arm in an improper way.

Porr also disavowed any knowledge of any scheme to strip Theriot of any of her powers at work or to make her look bad. He said he did try to avoid Theriot after she accused him of sexual harassment, but insisted he did not try to retaliate against her in any way.

Porr testified in the trial of a lawsuit filed by Theriot, who says Porr made inappropriate and sexually suggestive advances when she worked for him at Madigan Army Medical Center near Tacoma. She says that top-level officers then branded her a liar and a troublemaker and retaliated against her.

Theriot is seeking unspecified damages to compensate for what she describes as harassment in late 1995 and retaliation that she says continues to this day. She says Porr stroked her arm, tried to kiss her on the lips, repeatedly commented on her appearance and asked what she deemed to be personal questions.

Porr testified that when Theriot first confronted him, he said he told her he was sorry that she had perceived any of his actions to be harassment.

"There was no intent on my part," he said.

The only allegation by Theriot that he confirmed under oath was that he complimented her clothes on several occasions. But he said he had no recollection of commenting on her jewelry and never tried to kiss her.

Earlier Monday, a forensic psychologist testified that the Army's alleged retaliation against Theriot plunged her into severe emotional problems similar to post-traumatic stress syndrome.

Stuart Greenberg, the Seattle expert who examined Theriot and all of her case files, said the woman seemed less distressed by harassment than by retaliation she says she encountered in the months after she lodged a complaint and eventually filed a lawsuit.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Joseph Maloney, representing the Army, says there was neither harassment nor retaliation. He said Theriot continues to hold her old job and gets the top performance rating.

Greenberg, one of the key witnesses for the plaintiff, said Theriot was a "happy, healthy, assertive, secure, well-functioning, professionally successful woman" with a happy home life before the episodes she described to the jury.

But psychological tests administered later showed her to be suffering severe emotional distress, confused and anxious, depressed, distracted and iso-

lated, he said.

Greenberg said Theriot reported nightmares and menstrual periods that lasted two or three weeks each month. She sometimes digs into her hands until they bleed and curls up on the floor in a fetal position. Her marriage is troubled and "the children feel like they have lost their mom," he said.

Theriot and other witnesses told the jury earlier that she was isolated by her superiors, had job duties and powers reduced and was generally "set up to fail."

Theriot was always highly regarded by her peers at Madigan and other Army hospitals across the country, but "now she was getting identified as the troublemaker," her job performance was undermined, her integrity was impugned and her reputation was being destroyed, Greenberg said.

Under cross-examination, he agreed that filing the lawsuit itself can be causing stress for Theriot. He called it "litigation stress."

But he added that he can distinguish between that anxiety and other problems she is having.

Christian Science Monitor May 13, 1998 Pg. 4

The Sky's No Limit As Air Force Aims Spaceward

As Satellites Become More Crucial, Air Force Expands Its Role In Outer Space.

James N. Thurman
Staff writer of The
Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON - "Aim High" has long been a slogan of the United States Air Force.

Now it's aiming even higher.

The Air Force's fundamental purpose is again adapting to the newest platform from which war is waged: outer space.

The Air Force's mission evolution is so complete that there are persistent rumors of an eventual name change for the service. Any such Space Force, or Aerospace Force is officially still years in the future, but a combination of the current day fighter-bomber role with a space-based intelligence mission that feeds all of the military services is well under way.

Already, about 30 percent of the Air Force's mission is space related. And 90 percent of what the US military spends on space comes from the Air Force.

"You are seeing a significant increase in the investment in space," says Glen Bruels, a vice president at Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, a consulting firm.

In the past three decades, the heavens have gone from a mysterious and unexplored realm to a crucial, strategic vantage point, from which the US and other countries spy, communicate, and relay information.

Indeed, space programs are now elbowing up to the budget table alongside traditional, big-ticket programs like the Joint Strike Fighter and the radar evading F-22.

The à la carte menu of space-based programs includes the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle, or EELV. This $2 billion program is designed to save $5 billion to $10 billion over the next 20 years by using cheaper vehicles to launch satellites.

Milstar satellites, orbiting more than 22,000 miles above earth, relay military communications through each other, making jamming and interception more difficult. Two are now in orbit. Four more are planned.

Beaming missiles, maps

Satellites are also indispensable in today's battlefield operations. They beam down digital signals that guide a bunker-busting missile into the Iraqi sands or provide 3-D maps of mountain valleys in Bosnia to foot soldiers.

"We'll depend a lot more on space than we have in the past," says Michael Vickers, director of Strategic Studies at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a Washington think tank.

The Gulf War, called the first space war, proved the pinpoint efficacy of satellite-guided munitions. Satellites also relay navigation signals, provide crucial weather data, and detect missile launches. And their reconnaissance abilities are legendary.

While the military's spaceward trend is clear, its new strategic outlines are still emerging.

For instance, a future Space Force may be called on to protect commercial satellites in space. Congress could eventually ask the military to develop a protective mission the way the Navy patrols the open ocean.

Today's "passive" orbiting satellites aren't built to withstand attacks or to shoot at other satellites. But as the number of US commercial and military satellites - now 220 - swells to 1,800 over the next 10 years at a cost of a $1 trillion, that could change. The US may have to protect this massive investment The vast majority of these orbiting craft will be commercial - put into orbit by the telecommunications and entertainment industries.

In fact, in the past two years, spending on commercial satellites has eclipsed similar government expenditures, including those by NASA, and the military and intelligence communities combined.

Nevertheless, the military already has a major presence in space. The Pentagon spends $35 million a day in space.

The Air Force Space Command at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado "defends America through its space and intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) operations," according to its mission statement.

Meanwhile, the National Reconnaissance Office oversees construction, launching, and information gathering from satellites.

In need of a Space Force?

As the use of space by military and commercial interests grows -and to avoid duplication of effort - some think a separate space service will eventually be necessary to launch, operate, and organize the information transmitted down to earth.

Many experts say the Air Force is the heir apparent to create this new force. Yet Air Force ownership of space is not a done deal. "Space is an area the Navy would also like to be involved in," says Lawrence Korb, a senior fellow at The Brookings Institution.

The Navy is the single largest military consumer of satellite intelligence. "My guess is the Navy won't go quietly," says Dr. Korb.

But change is well under way as the Air Force integrates its current mission with space-based intelligence gathering that feeds all military services.

"This evolution is a 40-year development," says retired Air Force General Tom Moormon, who has been at the forefront of the Air Force's long-range space planning for many years.

Wall Street Journal May 13, 1998 Pg. 1

Secretary of State Albright denied the U.S. was giving Israel an ultimatum, but appealed publicly for acceptance of Washington's proposal for an Israeli withdrawal from 13% of the West Bank. Albright met with U.S. Jewish leaders in an apparent effort to combat an expected media blitz by Netanyahu, who is due in the U.S. today.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON , WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski **NEWS DIRECTOR:** Taft Phoebus **EARLY BIRD EDITOR:** Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe **ADMINISTRATION:** Wendy Powers **PRODUCTION:** Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)